arXiv:1612.08483v1 [math.DG] 27 Dec 2016

COMPARISON GEOMETRY OF MANIFOLDS WITH BOUNDARY UNDER A LOWER WEIGHTED RICCI CURVATURE BOUND

YOHEI SAKURAI

Abstract. We study Riemannian manifolds with boundary under a lower weighted Ricci curvature bound. We consider a curvature condition in which the weighted Ricci curvature is bounded from below by the weighting function beyond the usual constant bound setting. Under the curvature condition, and a suitable condition for the weighted mean curvature for the boundary, we obtain various comparison geometric results and rigidity theorems.

1. Introduction

In the present paper, we study comparison geometry of Riemannian manifolds with boundary under a lower weighted Ricci curvature bound. Concerning the lower weighted Ricci curvature bound, we consider a curvature condition in which the lower bound is controlled by the weighting function. We introduce a reasonable curvature condition for a lower weighted mean curvature bound for the boundary. Under the curvature conditions, we examine comparison geometric properties, and conclude several twisted rigidity theorems.

For $n \geq 2$, let M be an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold with or without boundary with Riemannian metric g, and let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. We denote by Ric_g the Ricci curvature defined by g, by ∇f the gradient of f, and by $\mathrm{Hess}\, f$ the Hessian of f. For $N \in (-\infty, \infty]$, the *N-weighted Ricci curvature* Ric_f^N is defined as

$$\mathrm{Ric}_f^N := \mathrm{Ric}_g + \mathrm{Hess}\, f - \frac{\nabla f \otimes \nabla f}{N-n} \tag{1.1}$$

if $N \in (-\infty, \infty)\backslash\{n\}$; otherwise, if $N = \infty$, then $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N := \mathrm{Ric}_g + \mathrm{Hess}\, f$; if $N = n$, and if f is constant, then $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N := \mathrm{Ric}_g$; if $N = n$, and if f is not constant, then $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N := -\infty$ ([2]).

Date: December 27, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C20.

Key words and phrases. Manifold with boundary; Weighted Ricci curvature.

Research Fellow of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for 2014-2016.

For manifolds without boundary whose N-weighted Ricci curvatures are bound from below by constants, we have already known many comparison geometric results in the usual weighted case of $N \in [n, \infty]$ (see e.g., [7], [14], [15], [18], [25], and so on). For manifolds with boundary, the author [21] has studied such comparison geometric properties.

Recently, under a lower N-weighted Ricci curvature bound, Wylie [26], and Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] have studied comparison geometry of manifolds without boundary in the complemental case of $N \in (-\infty, n)$. Wylie [26] has proved a splitting theorem of Cheeger-Gromoll type for manifolds of non-negative N-weighted Ricci curvature for $N \in (-\infty, 1]$. For $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in (-\infty, \infty]$, Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] have introduced a curvature condition

$$\mathrm{Ric}^N_{f,M} \geq (n-1)\,\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f}{n-1}}, \tag{1.2}$$

where (1.2) means that for every $x \in M$, and for every unit vector u at x we have $\mathrm{Ric}^N_f(u) \geq (n-1)\,\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(x)}{n-1}}$. Under the curvature condition (1.2) for $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] have proved a maximal diameter theorem of Cheng type for the Riemannian distance induced from a Riemannian metric $e^{\frac{-4f}{n-1}}g$, and a volume comparison theorem of Bishop-Gromov type for a weighted measure $e^{-\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\,\mathrm{vol}_g$, where vol_g is the Riemannian volume measure induced from g.

In this paper, we study comparison geometry of manifolds with boundary satisfying (1.2) for $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in (-\infty, \infty]$. To develop such comparison geometry, we consider a curvature condition for the boundary that is compatible with (1.2). For a Riemannian manifold M with boundary, let ∂M denote the boundary of M. For $z \in \partial M$, and for the mean curvature H_z on ∂M at z, the *f-mean curvature* $H_{f,z}$ is defined as $H_{f,z} := H_z + g\left((\nabla f)_z, u_z\right)$, where u_z is the unit inner normal vector at z. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce a curvature condition

$$H_{f,\partial M} \geq (n-1)\,\lambda\, e^{\frac{-2f}{n-1}}, \tag{1.3}$$

where (1.3) means that for every $z \in \partial M$ we have $H_{f,z} \geq (n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. Under the curvature conditions (1.2) and (1.3) for $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$, we establish various comparison geometric results and twisted rigidity theorems. We generalize the preceding studies done by Kasue [10], [11], and by the author [20] in the case of $f = 0$.

1.1. **Setting.** In the present paper, we work in the following setting: For $n \geq 2$, let M be an n-dimensional, connected complete Riemannian manifold with boundary with Riemannian metric g. Let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. For $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in (-\infty, \infty]$, we say that a

triple $(M, \partial M, f)$ has *lower* (κ, λ, N)*-weighted curvature bounds* if we have (1.2) and (1.3). Note that for $N_1 \in (-\infty, n)$ and $N_2 \in (n, \infty]$, if $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N_1)-weighted curvature bounds, then it does lower (κ, λ, N_2)-weighted curvature bounds (see (1.1) and (1.2)). We mainly study a triple $(M, \partial M, f)$ with lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds for $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$.

1.2. **Splitting theorems.** For the Riemannian distance d_M on M, the distance function $\rho_{\partial M} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ from ∂M is defined as $\rho_{\partial M}(x) := d_M(x, \partial M)$. For $z \in \partial M$, let $\gamma_z : [0, T) \to M$ be the geodesic with $\gamma_z(0) = z$ and $\gamma_z'(0) = u_z$. We define a function $\tau : \partial M \to (0, \infty]$ by

$$\tau(z) := \sup\{\, t > 0 \mid \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) = t \,\}, \tag{1.4}$$

and a function $\tau_f : \partial M \to (0, \infty]$ by

$$\tau_f(z) := \int_0^{\tau(z)} e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(a))}{n-1}}\, da. \tag{1.5}$$

We also define a function $s_{f,z} : [0, \tau(z)] \to [0, \tau_f(z)]$ by

$$s_{f,z}(t) := \int_0^{t} e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(a))}{n-1}}\, da. \tag{1.6}$$

Let $s_{\kappa,\lambda}(t)$ denote a unique solution of the so-called Jacobi-equation $\varphi''(t) + \kappa\varphi(t) = 0$ with initial conditions $\varphi(0) = 1$ and $\varphi'(0) = -\lambda$. Let $F_{\kappa,\lambda,z} : [0, \tau(z)] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined by

$$F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}(t) := \exp\left(\frac{f(\gamma_z(t)) - f(z)}{n-1}\right) s_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_{f,z}(t)). \tag{1.7}$$

Let h denote the induced Riemannian metric on ∂M. For an interval I, and for a connected component ∂M_1 of ∂M, we denote by $I \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M_1$ the twisted product Riemannian manifold $\bigl(I \times \partial M_1, dt^2 + F^2_{\kappa,\lambda,z}(t)\, h\bigr)$.

One of the main results is the following twisted splitting theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\kappa \leq 0$ and $\lambda := \sqrt{|\kappa|}$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that f is bounded from above. If for some point $z_0 \in \partial M$ we have $\tau(z_0) = \infty$, then M is isometric to $[0, \infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1) \cup [n, \infty]$, then for every $z \in \partial M$ the function $f \circ \gamma_z$ is constant on $[0, \infty)$.*

In the case where $\kappa = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$, Theorem 1.1 has been obtained by the author [21] when $N \in [n, \infty]$, and by the author [22] when $N \in (-\infty, 1]$. In the case of $f = 0$, Kasue [10] has proved Theorem 1.1 under the assumption that M is non-compact and ∂M is compact (see

also Croke and Kleiner [6]), and the author [20] has proved Theorem 1.1 itself.

In Theorem 1.1, by applying a splitting theorem proved by Wylie [26] to the boundary, we obtain a multi-splitting theorem (see Subsection 5.3). We also generalize a splitting theorem studied by Kasue [10] (and Croke and Kleiner [6], Ichida [9]) (see Subsection 5.4).

1.3. **Inscribed radii.** We denote by M^n_κ the simply connected n-dimensional space form with constant curvature κ. We say that κ and λ satisfy the *ball-condition* if there exists a closed geodesic ball $B^n_{\kappa,\lambda}$ in M^n_κ with non-empty boundary $\partial B^n_{\kappa,\lambda}$ such that $\partial B^n_{\kappa,\lambda}$ has a constant mean curvature $(n-1)\lambda$. Let $C_{\kappa,\lambda}$ denote the radius of $B^n_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Note that κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition if and only if either (1) $\kappa > 0$; (2) $\kappa = 0$ and $\lambda > 0$; or (3) $\kappa < 0$ and $\lambda > \sqrt{|\kappa|}$. We see that κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition if and only if the equation $s_{\kappa,\lambda}(t) = 0$ has a positive solution; in particular, $C_{\kappa,\lambda} = \inf\{\, t > 0 \mid s_{\kappa,\lambda}(t) = 0 \,\}$.

The *inscribed radius* $D(M, \partial M)$ *of* M is defined as

$$D(M, \partial M) := \sup_{x \in M} \rho_{\partial M}(x).$$

Let g_f be a Riemannian metric on M defined by $g_f := e^{\frac{-4f}{n-1}} g$. Let $d^{g_f}_M$ denote the Riemannian distance on M induced from g_f. We define a function $\rho^{g_f}_{\partial M} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\rho^{g_f}_{\partial M}(x) := d^{g_f}_M(x, \partial M)$, and we put

$$D^{g_f}(M, \partial M) := \sup_{x \in M} \rho^{g_f}_{\partial M}(x). \tag{1.8}$$

Note that if $f = 0$, then $D^{g_f}(M, \partial M)$ is equal to $D(M, \partial M)$.

For the interior $\operatorname{Int} M$ of M, and for $x \in \operatorname{Int} M$, let $U_x M$ be the unit tangent sphere at x which can be identified with the $(n-1)$-dimensional standard unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. For $u \in U_x M$, let $\gamma_u : [0, T) \to M$ be the geodesic with $\gamma_u(0) = x$ and $\gamma'_u(0) = u$. Define $\tau_x : U_x M \to (0, \infty]$ by

$$\tau_x(u) := \sup\{\, t > 0 \mid \rho_x(\gamma_u(t)) = t,\ \gamma_u([0, t)) \subset \operatorname{Int} M \,\}, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\rho_x : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is the distance function from x defined as $\rho_x(y) := d_M(x, y)$. Let $s_{f,u} : [0, \tau_x(u)] \to [0, \infty]$ be a function defined by

$$s_{f,u}(t) := \int_0^t e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_u(a))}{n-1}}\, da. \tag{1.10}$$

Let $s_\kappa(t)$ be a unique solution of the Jacobi-equation $\varphi''(t) + \kappa\varphi(t) = 0$ with initial conditions $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi'(0) = 1$. We define a function $F_{\kappa,u} : [0, \tau_x(u)] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_{\kappa,u}(t) := \exp\left(\frac{f(\gamma_u(t)) + f(x)}{n-1}\right) s_\kappa(s_{f,u}(t)). \tag{1.11}$$

For $l > 0$, we denote by $[0,l] \times_{F_\kappa} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ the twisted product Riemannian manifold $\big([0,l] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, dt^2 + F^2_{\kappa,u}(t) ds^2_{n-1}\big)$, where ds^2_{n-1} is the canonical metric on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

We conclude the following theorem for the inscribed radii:

Theorem 1.2. *Let us assume that κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Then we have*

$$D^{g_f}(M, \partial M) \le C_{\kappa,\lambda}. \tag{1.12}$$

If for some $x_0 \in M$ we have $\rho^{g_f}_{\partial M}(x_0) = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$, then there exists $l > 0$ such that M is isometric to $[0,l] \times_{F_\kappa} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1) \cup [n, \infty]$, then f is constant; in particular, M is isometric to a closed geodesic ball in a simply connected space form.

Kasue [10] has proved Theorem 1.2 in the case of $f = 0$.

For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, define a function $\rho_{\partial M,\delta}$ on M by $\rho_{\partial M,\delta} := e^{-2\delta} \rho_{\partial M}$. Put

$$D_\delta(M, \partial M) := \sup_{x \in M} \rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x). \tag{1.13}$$

If f is bounded from above, then we obtain the following:

Theorem 1.3. *Let us assume that κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. Then we have*

$$D_\delta(M, \partial M) \le C_{\kappa,\lambda}. \tag{1.14}$$

If for some $x_0 \in M$ we have $\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x_0) = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$, then M is isometric to $B^n_{\kappa e^{-4\delta}, \lambda e^{-2\delta}}$, and $f = (n-1)\delta$ on M.

1.4. **Volume growths.** For $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we put $\bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda} := C_{\kappa,\lambda}$ if κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition; otherwise, $\bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda} := \infty$. We define functions $\bar{s}_{\kappa,\lambda}$, $s_{n,\kappa,\lambda} : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\bar{s}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s) := \begin{cases} s_{\kappa,\lambda}(s) & \text{if } s < \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}, \\ 0 & \text{if } s \ge \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}, \end{cases} \quad s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r) := \int_0^r \bar{s}^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(a)\, da. \tag{1.15}$$

For a smooth function $\phi : M \to \mathbb{R}$, we put $m_\phi := e^{-\phi} \mathrm{vol}_g$. For $x \in M$ and $z \in \partial M$, we say that z is a *foot point on ∂M of x* if $d_M(x,z) = \rho_{\partial M}(x)$. Note that every point in M has at least one foot point on ∂M. We define a function $\rho_{\partial M,f} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\rho_{\partial M,f}(x) := \inf_{z \in \partial M} \int_0^{\rho_{\partial M}(x)} e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(a))}{n-1}}\, da, \tag{1.16}$$

where the infimum is taken over all foot points z on ∂M of x. For $r > 0$, we put $B_{r,f}(\partial M) := \{\, x \in M \mid \rho_{\partial M,f}(x) \le r \,\}$.

For neighborhoods of the boundary, we prove absolute volume comparison results of Heintze-Karcher type, and relative volume comparison theorems of Bishop-Gromov type (see Subsections 7.2 and 7.3).

One of the relative volume comparison theorems is the following:

Theorem 1.4. *For $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. Then for all $r, R > 0$ with $r \le R$ we have*

$$\frac{m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{R,f}(\partial M))}{m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{r,f}(\partial M))} \le \frac{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}. \tag{1.17}$$

The author [20] has proved Theorem 1.4 in the case of $f = 0$.

We provide a rigidity theorem concerning the equality case of Theorem 1.4 (see Theorem 7.10). We also prove a volume growth rigidity theorem in the case where f is bounded from above (see Theorem 7.12).

1.5. **Eigenvalues.** Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, and let $\phi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. The $(1,p)$-*Sobolev space* $W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)$ *on* (M, m_ϕ) *with compact support* is defined as the completion of the set of all smooth functions on M whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$ with respect to the standard $(1,p)$-Sobolev norm. We denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the standard norm induced from g, and by div the divergence with respect to g. The (ϕ,p)-*Laplacian* $\Delta_{\phi,p}\,\psi$ for $\psi \in W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)$ is defined by

$$\Delta_{\phi,p}\,\psi := -e^{\phi}\ \mathrm{div}\ \left(e^{-\phi}\|\nabla\psi\|^{p-2}\,\nabla\psi\right)$$

as a distribution on $W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)$. A real number μ is said to be a (ϕ,p)-*Dirichlet eigenvalue* on M if there exists a non-zero $\psi \in W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)$ such that $\Delta_{\phi,p}\psi = \mu|\psi|^{p-2}\,\psi$ holds on $\operatorname{Int} M$ in a distribution sense on $W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)$. The *Rayleigh quotient* $R_{\phi,p}(\psi)$ for $\psi \in W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)\backslash\{0\}$ is defined as

$$R_{\phi,p}(\psi) := \frac{\int_M \|\nabla\psi\|^p \, d\, m_\phi}{\int_M |\psi|^p \, d\, m_\phi}.$$

We put $\mu_{\phi,p}(M) := \inf_\psi R_{\phi,p}(\psi)$, where the infimum is taken over all non-zero functions in $W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)$. The value $\mu_{\phi,2}(M)$ is equal to the infimum of the spectrum of $\Delta_{\phi,2}$ on (M, m_ϕ). If M is compact, and if $p \in (1, \infty)$, then $\mu_{\phi,p}(M)$ is equal to the infimum of the set of all (ϕ,p)-Dirichlet eigenvalues on M. If ϕ is a constant function on M, then $\mu_{\phi,p}(M)$ can be written by $\mu_{0,p}(M)$.

Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. For $D \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}] \setminus \{\infty\}$, let $\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}$ be the positive minimum real number μ such that there exists a non-zero function $\varphi : [0,D] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}(1.18)\quad &\big(|\varphi'(s)|^{p-2}\varphi'(s)\big)' + (n-1)\frac{s'_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)}\,\big(|\varphi'(s)|^{p-2}\varphi'(s)\big) \\ &\qquad + \mu\,|\varphi(s)|^{p-2}\varphi(s) = 0,\ \varphi(0) = 0,\ \varphi'(D) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

We recall the notion of model spaces that has been introduced by Kasue in [11] in our setting. We say that κ and λ satisfy the *model-condition* if the equation $s'_{\kappa,\lambda}(t) = 0$ has a positive solution. We see that κ and λ satisfy the model-condition if and only if either (1) $\kappa > 0$ and $\lambda < 0$; (2) $\kappa = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$; or (3) $\kappa < 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, \sqrt{|\kappa|})$.

Let κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition or the model-condition. Assume that M is compact. For an interval I, and for a connected component ∂M_1 of ∂M, we denote by $I \times_{\kappa,\lambda} \partial M_1$ the warped product Riemannian manifold $\big(I \times \partial M_1, dt^2 + s^2_{\kappa,\lambda}(t)\,h\big)$. If κ and λ satisfy the model-condition, then we define a positive number $D_{\kappa,\lambda}(M)$ as follows: If $\kappa = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$, then $D_{\kappa,\lambda}(M) := D(M,\partial M)$; otherwise, $D_{\kappa,\lambda}(M) := \{t > 0 \mid s'_{\kappa,\lambda}(t) = 0\}$. We say that M is isometric to a (κ,λ)-*equational model space* if M is isometric to either (1) for κ and λ satisfying the ball-condition, the closed geodesic ball $B^n_{\kappa,\lambda}$; (2) for κ and λ satisfying the model-condition, and for a connected component ∂M_1 of ∂M, the warped product $[0, 2D_{\kappa,\lambda}(M)] \times_{\kappa,\lambda} \partial M_1$; or (3) for κ and λ satisfying the model-condition, and for an involutive isometry σ of ∂M without fixed points, the quotient space $([0, 2D_{\kappa,\lambda}(M)] \times_{\kappa,\lambda} \partial M)\,/G_\sigma$, where G_σ is the isometry group on $[0, 2D_{\kappa,\lambda}(M)] \times_{\kappa,\lambda} \partial M$ whose elements consist of the identity and the involute isometry $\hat{\sigma}$ defined by $\hat{\sigma}(t,z) := (2D_{\kappa,\lambda}(M) - t, \sigma(z))$.

We say that the function f is ∂M-*radial* if there exists a smooth function $\phi_f : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f = \phi_f \circ \rho_{\partial M}$ on M. For the function $\rho_{\partial M,f} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as (1.16), we put

$$(1.19)\qquad D_f(M,\partial M) := \sup_{x\in M} \rho_{\partial M,f}(x).$$

We establish the following theorem for the smallest eigenvalue $\mu_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f,p}$:

Theorem 1.5. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. For $N \in (-\infty,1] \cup [n,\infty]$, assume that $(M,\partial M,f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that M is compact, and f is ∂M-radial. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. For $D \in (0,\bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}]\setminus\{\infty\}$, suppose $D_f(M,\partial M) \le D$. Then we have*

$$(1.20)\qquad \mu_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f,p}(M) \ge e^{-2p\delta}\,\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}.$$

If the equality in (1.20) *holds, then* M *is isometric to a* $\left(\kappa e^{-4\delta}, \lambda e^{-2\delta}\right)$*-equational model space, and* $f = (n-1)\delta$ *on* M*.*

In the case where $f = 0$ and $\delta = 0$, Kasue [11] has proved Theorem 1.5 for $p = 2$, and the author [21] has done for any $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Remark 1.1. In Theorem 1.5, the author does not know whether the assumption that f is ∂M-radial can be dropped.

We say that κ and λ satisfy the *convex-ball-condition* if they satisfy the ball-condition and $\lambda \geq 0$. For $\kappa \leq 0$, we see that κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition if and only if they satisfy the ball-condition.

In the case where f is not necessarily ∂M-radial, we formulate the following rigidity theorem:

Theorem 1.6. *Let* $p \in (1, \infty)$*. Let* κ *and* λ *satisfy the convex-ball-condition. For* $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$*, assume that* $(M, \partial M, f)$ *has lower* (κ, λ, N)*-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that* M *is compact. For* $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$*, suppose* $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ *on* M*. Then we have*

$$\mu_{f,p}(M) \geq e^{-2p\delta} \mu_{0,p}(B^n_{\kappa,\lambda}). \tag{1.21}$$

If the equality in (1.21) *holds, then* M *is isometric to* $B^n_{\kappa e^{-4\delta}, \lambda e^{-2\delta}}$*, and* $f = (n-1)\delta$ *on* M*.*

Remark 1.2. The author does not know whether Theorem 1.6 holds under the assumption that κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition.

1.6. **Spectra.** We show a volume estimate for a domain in M (see Proposition 9.1). From the volume estimate we derive a lower bound for $\mu_{f,p}$ (see Theorem 9.3). Combining the estimate for $\mu_{f,p}$ and Theorem 1.1, we conclude the following twisted rigidity theorem for manifolds with boundary that are not necessarily compact:

Theorem 1.7. *Let* $p \in (1, \infty)$*. Let* $\kappa < 0$ *and* $\lambda := \sqrt{|\kappa|}$*. For* $N \in (-\infty, 1] \cup [n, \infty]$*, assume that* $(M, \partial M, f)$ *has lower* (κ, λ, N)*-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that* ∂M *is compact. For* $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$*, suppose* $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ *on* M*. Then*

$$\mu_{f,p}(M) \geq e^{-2p\delta} \left(\frac{(n-1)\lambda}{p} \right)^p. \tag{1.22}$$

If the equality in (1.22) *holds, then* M *is isometric to* $[0, \infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$*; moreover, if* $N \in (-\infty, 1) \cup [n, \infty]$*, then for every* $z \in \partial M$ *the function* $f \circ \gamma_z$ *is constant on* $[0, \infty)$*.*

The author [20] has proved Theorem 1.7 when $f = 0$ and $\delta = 0$.

1.7. **Plans.** By the monotonicity of the lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds for N, for the proofs of our main theorems, it suffices to consider the case of $N \in (-\infty, 1]$ (see Subsection 1.1). Hereafter, we study a triple $(M, \partial M, f)$ with lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds for $N \in (-\infty, 1]$. All the claims for $N \in (-\infty, 1]$ discussed below are also valid in the usual weighted case of $N \in [n, \infty]$.

In our studies, the main tools are Laplacian comparisons for the distance function $\rho_{\partial M}$. Using a pointwise Laplacian comparison result for $\rho_{\partial M}$, we obtain splitting theorems, and comparison geometric results for the inscribed radii and the volume growths. To conclude comparison geometric results for the weighted p-Laplacians, we establish global Laplacian comparison theorems for $\rho_{\partial M}$ in a distribution sense. The key points are to find a reasonable assumption for the function f, and to choose a suitable weighted p-Laplace operator and a weighted distance function. Under the assumption that $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, we prove a global Laplacian comparison result for the operator $\Delta_{f,p}$ and the function $\rho_{\partial M,\delta}$. Under the assumption that f is ∂M-radial, we also prove such a result for the operator $\Delta_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1},p}$ and the function $\rho_{\partial M,f}$.

1.8. **Organization.** In Section 2, we prepare some notations and recall the basic facts for Riemannian manifolds with boundary. We also recall the works done by Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] (see Subsection 2.6).

In Sections 3 and 4, to prove our main theorems, we study Laplacian comparisons for the distance function from the boundary. In Section 3, we show a pointwise Laplacian comparison result (see Subsection 3.1), and a rigidity result in the equality case (see Subsection 3.2). In Section 4, we prove global Laplacian comparison results in the case where f is bounded from above (see Subsection 4.1), and in the case where f is ∂M-radial (see Subsection 4.2).

In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.1, and study the variants of the splitting theorems. In Section 6, we prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. In Section 7, we prove Theorem 1.4, and conclude volume growth rigidity theorems. In Section 8, we prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.6, and study explicit lower bounds of $\mu_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f,p}$. In Section 9, we prove Theorem 1.7.

Acknowledgements**.** The author would like to express his gratitude to Professor Koichi Nagano for his constant advice and suggestions. The author would also like to thank Professor William Wylie for informing him of the paper [27]. The author is grateful to Professor Shin-ichi Ohta for his valuable comments.

2. Preliminaries

We refer to [19] for the basics of Riemannian manifolds with boundary (see also Section 2 in [20], [21] and [22]).

2.1. **Riemannian manifolds with boundary.** Let M be a connected Riemannian manifold with boundary. Let d_M be the Riemannian distance on M. For $r > 0$ and $A \subset M$, we denote by $B_r(A)$ the closed r-neighborhood of A in M. For an interval I, we say that a curve $\gamma : I \to M$ is a *minimal geodesic* if for all $t_1, t_2 \in I$ we have $d_M(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2|$. If M is complete with respect to d_M, then the Hopf-Rinow theorem for length spaces (see e.g., Theorem 2.5.23 in [3]) tells us that the metric space (M, d_M) is a proper geodesic space.

For $i = 1, 2$, let M_i be connected Riemannian manifolds with boundary with Riemannian metric g_i. For each i, the boundary ∂M_i carries the induced Riemannian metric h_i. We say that a homeomorphism $\Phi : M_1 \to M_2$ is a *Riemannian isometry with boundary* from M_1 to M_2 if Φ satisfies the following conditions:

(1) $\Phi|_{\operatorname{Int} M_1} : \operatorname{Int} M_1 \to \operatorname{Int} M_2$ is smooth, and $(\Phi|_{\operatorname{Int} M_1})^*(g_2) = g_1$;
(2) $\Phi|_{\partial M_1} : \partial M_1 \to \partial M_2$ is smooth, and $(\Phi|_{\partial M_1})^*(h_2) = h_1$.

If $\Phi : M_1 \to M_2$ is a Riemannian isometry with boundary, then the inverse Φ^{-1} is also a Riemannian isometry with boundary. Notice that there exists a Riemannian isometry with boundary from M_1 to M_2 if and only if the metric space (M_1, d_{M_1}) is isometric to (M_2, d_{M_2}) (see e.g., Section 2 in [20]).

2.2. **Jacobi fields orthogonal to the boundary.** Let M be a connected Riemannian manifold with boundary with Riemannian metric g. For $x \in \operatorname{Int} M$, let T_xM and U_xM be the tangent space at x and the unit tangent sphere at x, respectively. For $z \in \partial M$, and for the tangent space $T_z\partial M$ at z on ∂M, let $T_z^\perp \partial M$ be the orthogonal complement of $T_z\partial M$ in the tangent space at z on M. Take $u \in T_z^\perp \partial M$. For the second fundamental form S of ∂M, let $A_u : T_z\partial M \to T_z\partial M$ be the *shape operator* for u defined as

$$g(A_u v, w) := g(S(v, w), u).$$

Let u_z be the unit inner normal vector at z. The *mean curvature* H_z at z is defined as $H_z := \operatorname{trace} A_{u_z}$. Let $\gamma_z : [0, T) \to M$ be the geodesic with $\gamma_z(0) = z$ and $\gamma_z'(0) = u_z$. We say that a Jacobi field Y along γ_z is a *∂M-Jacobi field* if Y satisfies the following initial conditions:

$$Y(0) \in T_z\partial M, \quad Y'(0) + A_{u_z} Y(0) \in T_z^\perp \partial M.$$

We say that $\gamma_z(t_0)$ is a *conjugate point* of ∂M along γ_z if there exists a non-zero ∂M-Jacobi field Y along γ_z with $Y(t_0) = 0$.

2.3. **Cut locus for the boundary.** We recall the basic properties of the cut locus for the boundary. The basic properties mentioned below seem to be well-known. We refer to [20] for the proofs.

Let M be a connected complete Riemannian manifold with boundary with Riemannian metric g. For $x \in M$, we call $z \in \partial M$ a *foot point* on ∂M of x if $d_M(x, z) = \rho_{\partial M}(x)$. Since (M, d_M) is proper, every point in M has at least one foot point on ∂M. For $x \in \operatorname{Int} M$, let $z \in \partial M$ be a foot point on ∂M of x. Then there exists a unique minimal geodesic $\gamma : [0, l] \to M$ from z to x such that $\gamma = \gamma_z|_{[0,l]}$, where $l = \rho_{\partial M}(x)$. In particular, $\gamma'(0) = u_z$ and $\gamma|_{(0,l]}$ lies in $\operatorname{Int} M$.

Let $\tau : \partial M \to (0, \infty]$ be the function defined as (1.4). For the inscribed radius $D(M, \partial M)$ of M, we see $D(M, \partial M) = \sup_{z \in \partial M} \tau(z)$. The function τ is continuous on ∂M. The continuity of τ implies that if ∂M is compact, then $D(M, \partial M)$ is finite if and only if M is compact.

The *cut locus* $\operatorname{Cut} \partial M$ *for the boundary* is defined as

$$\operatorname{Cut} \partial M := \{\, \gamma_z(\tau(z)) \mid z \in \partial M,\, \tau(z) < \infty \,\}.$$

From the continuity of τ we see that $\operatorname{Cut} \partial M$ is a null set of M.

In [20], we have already known the following:

Lemma 2.1. *If there exists a connected component ∂M_0 of ∂M such that for all $z \in \partial M_0$ we have $\tau(z) = \infty$, then ∂M is connected and $\operatorname{Cut} \partial M = \emptyset$.*

The function $\rho_{\partial M}$ is smooth on $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$. For each $x \in \operatorname{Int} M \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$, we have $\nabla \rho_{\partial M}(x) = \gamma'(l)$, where $\gamma : [0, l] \to M$ is the minimal geodesic from the foot point on ∂M of x to x.

For $\Omega \subset M$, we denote by $\bar{\Omega}$ the closure of Ω in M, and by $\partial\Omega$ the boundary of Ω in M. For a domain Ω in M such that $\partial\Omega$ is a smooth hypersurface in M, we denote by $\mathrm{vol}_{\partial\Omega}$ the canonical Riemannian volume measure on $\partial\Omega$.

We have the following fact to avoid the cut locus for the boundary (see Lemma 2.6 in [21]):

Lemma 2.2. *Let Ω be a domain in M such that $\partial\Omega$ is a smooth hypersurface in M. Then there exists a sequence $\{\Omega_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of closed subsets of $\bar{\Omega}$ such that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\partial\Omega_k$ is a smooth hypersurface in M except for a null set in $(\partial\Omega, \mathrm{vol}_{\partial\Omega})$ satisfying the following properties:*

1. *for all $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_1 < k_2$, we have $\Omega_{k_1} \subset \Omega_{k_2}$;*
2. *$\bar{\Omega} \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Omega_k$;*

(3) *for every* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*, and for almost every point* $x \in \partial\Omega_k \cap \partial\Omega$ *in* $(\partial\Omega, \mathrm{vol}_{\partial\Omega})$*, there exists a unique unit outer normal vector for* Ω_k *at* x *that coincides with the unit outer normal vector on* $\partial\Omega$ *for* Ω *at* x*;*
(4) *for every* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*, on* $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega$*, there exists a unique unit outer normal vector field* ν_k *for* Ω_k *such that* $g(\nu_k, \nabla\rho_{\partial M}) \geq 0$*.*

Moreover, if $\bar{\Omega} = M$*, then for every* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*, the set* $\partial\Omega_k$ *is a smooth hypersurface in* M*, and satisfies* $\partial\Omega_k \cap \partial M = \partial M$*.*

For the cut locus for a single point, we have known a similar fact to Lemma 2.2 (see e.g., Theorem 4.1 in [5]). One can prove Lemma 2.2 by a similar method to the case of the cut locus for a single point.

2.4. **Busemann functions and asymptotes.** Let M be a connected complete Riemannian manifold with boundary. A minimal geodesic $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to M$ is said to be a *ray*. For a ray $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to M$, the *Busemann function* $b_\gamma : M \to \mathbb{R}$ *of* γ is defined as

$$b_\gamma(x) := \lim_{t\to\infty}(t - d_M(x, \gamma(t))).$$

We have the following lemma (see Lemma 6.1 in [20]):

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that for some* $z \in \partial M$ *we have* $\tau(z) = \infty$*. Take* $x \in \operatorname{Int} M$*. If* $b_{\gamma_z}(x) = \rho_{\partial M}(x)$*, then* $x \notin \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$*. Moreover, for the unique foot point* z_x *on* ∂M *of* x*, we have* $\tau(z_x) = \infty$*.*

Let $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to M$ be a ray. For $x \in M$, we say that a ray $\gamma_x : [0, \infty) \to M$ is an *asymptote for* γ *from* x if there exists a sequence $\{t_i\}$ with $t_i \to \infty$ such that the following holds: For each i, there exists a minimal geodesic $\gamma_i : [0, l_i] \to M$ from x to $\gamma(t_i)$ such that for every $t \geq 0$ we have $\gamma_i(t) \to \gamma_x(t)$ as $i \to \infty$. Since M is proper, for each $x \in M$ there exists at least one asymptote for γ from x.

For asymptotes, we see the following (see Lemma 6.2 in [20]):

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that for some* $z \in \partial M$ *we have* $\tau(z) = \infty$*. For* $l > 0$*, put* $x := \gamma_z(l)$*. Then there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that for all* $y \in B_\epsilon(x)$*, all asymptotes for the ray* γ_z *from* y *lie in* $\operatorname{Int} M$*.*

2.5. **Weighted manifolds with boundary.** Let M be a connected complete Riemannian manifold with boundary with Riemannian metric g. Let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. For a smooth function ψ on M, the *weighted Laplacian* $\Delta_f\psi$ *for* ψ is defined by

$$\Delta_f\psi := \Delta\psi + g(\nabla f, \nabla\psi),$$

where $\Delta\psi$ is the Laplacian for ψ defined as the minus of the trace of its Hessian. Note that Δ_f coincides with the $(f, 2)$-Laplacian $\Delta_{f,2}$.

It seems that the following formula of Bochner type is well-known (see e.g., [7], and Chapter 14 in [24]).

Proposition 2.5 ([7]). *For every smooth function ψ on M, we have*

$$-\frac{1}{2}\,\Delta_f\,\|\nabla\psi\|^2 = \mathrm{Ric}_f^\infty(\nabla\psi) + \|\operatorname{Hess}\psi\|^2 - g\left(\nabla\Delta_f\,\psi, \nabla\psi\right),$$

where $\|\operatorname{Hess}\psi\|$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of $\operatorname{Hess}\psi$.

For $z \in \partial M$, the value $\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t))$ tends to $H_{f,z}$ as $t \to 0$. For $t \in (0, \tau(z))$, and for the volume element $\theta(t,z)$ of the t-level surface of $\rho_{\partial M}$ at $\gamma_z(t)$, we put $\theta_f(t,z) := e^{-f(\gamma_z(t))}\,\theta(t,z)$. For all $t \in (0,\tau(z))$,

$$\Delta_f\,\rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) = -\frac{\theta_f'(t,z)}{\theta_f(t,z)}. \tag{2.1}$$

For $r > 0$, we put $B_r(\partial M) := \{x \in M \mid \rho_{\partial M}(x) \le r\}$. We define a function $\bar\theta_f : [0,\infty) \times \partial M \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\bar\theta_f(t,z) := \begin{cases} \theta_f(t,z) & \text{if } t < \tau(z), \\ 0 & \text{if } t \ge \tau(z). \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Let vol_h be the Riemannian volume measure on ∂M induced from h.

The following has been shown in [21]:

Lemma 2.6. *If ∂M is compact, then for all $r > 0$*

$$m_f(B_r(\partial M)) = \int_{\partial M}\int_0^r \bar\theta_f(t,z)\,dt\,d\,\mathrm{vol}_h\,.$$

Let $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, and let U be a domain contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$. For $x \in U$, and for a function $\hat\psi$ defined on an open neighborhood of x, we say that $\hat\psi$ is a *support function of ψ at x* if we have $\hat\psi(x) = \psi(x)$ and $\hat\psi \le \psi$. We say that ψ is *f-subharmonic on U* if for every $x \in U$, and for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a smooth support function $\psi_{x,\epsilon}$ of ψ at x such that $\Delta_f\,\psi_{x,\epsilon}(x) \le \epsilon$.

We recall the following maximal principle of Calabi type (see e.g., [4], and Lemma 2.4 in [7]).

Lemma 2.7 ([4]). *Let U be a domain contained in* $\operatorname{Int} M$. *If an f-subharmonic function on U takes the maximal value at a point in U, then it must be constant on U.*

2.6. **Laplacian comparisons from a single point.** We recall the works done by Wylie and Yeroshkin [27]. Let M be an n-dimensional, connected complete Riemannian manifold with boundary, and let f :

$M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. For the diameter C_κ of M^n_κ, we define a function $H_\kappa : (0, C_\kappa) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$H_\kappa(s) := -(n-1)\frac{s'_\kappa(s)}{s_\kappa(s)}. \tag{2.3}$$

Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] have proved a Laplacian comparison inequality for the distance function from a single point (see Theorem 4.4 in [27]). In our setting, the inequality holds in the following form:

Lemma 2.8 ([27])**.** *Take $x \in \operatorname{Int} M$ and $u \in U_xM$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose $\operatorname{Ric}^N_{f,M} \geq (n-1)\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f}{n-1}}$. Then for all $t \in (0, \tau_x(u))$*

$$\Delta_f\, \rho_x(\gamma_u(t)) \geq H_\kappa(s_{f,u}(t))\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_u(t))}{n-1}}, \tag{2.4}$$

where τ_x and $s_{f,u}$ are the functions defined as (1.9) *and defined as* (1.10)*, respectively.*

As a corollary of the Laplacian comparison inequality, Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] have shown another Laplacian comparison inequality in the case where f is bounded (see Corollary 4.11 in [27]). In our setting, by using the same method of the proof, we see the following:

Lemma 2.9 ([27])**.** *Take $x \in \operatorname{Int} M$ and $u \in U_xM$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose $\operatorname{Ric}^N_{f,M} \geq (n-1)\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f}{n-1}}$. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ on M. Then for all $t \in (0, \tau_x(u))$*

$$\Delta_f\, \rho_x(\gamma_u(t)) \geq H_\kappa\left(e^{-2\delta}t\right)\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_u(t))}{n-1}}. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. We see $H'_\kappa > 0$ on $(0, C_\kappa)$. From the boundedness of f, for every $t \in (0, \tau_x(u))$, we deduce $s_{f,u}(t) \geq e^{-2\delta}t$. The inequality (2.4) implies

$$\Delta_f\, \rho_x(\gamma_u(t)) \geq H_\kappa(s_{f,u}(t))\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_u(t))}{n-1}} \geq H_\kappa\left(e^{-2\delta}t\right)\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_u(t))}{n-1}}, \tag{2.6}$$

and hence (2.5). □

Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] have proved a rigidity result in the equality case of the Laplacian comparison inequality (see Lemma 4.13 in [27]). From the argument discussed in their proof, we can derive:

Lemma 2.10 ([27])**.** *Under the same setting as in Lemma 2.8, assume that for some $t_0 \in (0, \tau_x(u))$ the equality in* (2.4) *holds. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ of T_xM with $e_{u,n} = u$. Let $\{Y_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the Jacobi fields along γ_u with initial conditions $Y_{u,i}(0) = 0_x$ and $Y'_{u,i}(0) = e_{u,i}$. Then for all i we have $Y_{u,i} = F_{\kappa,u}\, E_{u,i}$ on $[0, t_0]$, where $F_{\kappa,u}$ is the function defined as* (1.11)*, and $\{E_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_u with initial condition $E_{u,i}(0) = e_{u,i}$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then $f \circ \gamma_u$ is constant.*

Remark 2.1. Under the same setting as in Lemma 2.9, assume that for some $t_0 \in (0, \tau_x(u))$ the equality in (2.5) holds. Then the equalities in (2.6) hold. Hence, the equality in (2.4) holds (see Lemma 2.10), and $s_{f,u}(t_0) = e^{-2\delta} t_0$; in particular, $f \circ \gamma_u = (n-1)\delta$ on $[0, t_0]$.

3. Laplacian comparisons

From now on, let M denote an n-dimensional, connected complete Riemannian manifold with boundary with Riemannian metric g, and let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ denote a smooth function.

3.1. **Basic Laplacian comparisons.** For the distance function from a single point, Wylie and Yeroshkin [27] have shown an inequality of Riccati type (see Lemma 4.1 in [27]). By the same method of the proof, for the distance function from the boundary, we have the following inequality of Riccati type:

Lemma 3.1. *Take $z \in \partial M$. Let $N \in (-\infty, 1]$. Then for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}(3.1)\qquad &\left(\left(e^{\frac{2f}{n-1}}\,\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}\right)(\gamma_z(t))\right)' \\ &\geq \mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))\, e^{\frac{2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}} + \frac{\left(\left(e^{\frac{2f}{n-1}}\,\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}\right)(\gamma_z(t))\right)^2}{n-1}\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Put $f_z := f \circ \gamma_z$ and $h_{f,z} := (\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}) \circ \gamma_z$. Applying Proposition 2.5 to $\rho_{\partial M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \mathrm{Ric}_f^\infty(\gamma_z'(t)) + \|\operatorname{Hess}\rho_{\partial M}\|^2(\gamma_z(t)) - g\left(\nabla\Delta_f\rho_{\partial M}, \nabla\rho_{\partial M}\right)(\gamma_z(t)) \\ &= \left(\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t)) + \frac{f_z'(t)^2}{N-n}\right) + \|\operatorname{Hess}\rho_{\partial M}\|^2(\gamma_z(t)) - h_{f,z}'(t).\end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$(3.2)\qquad \|\operatorname{Hess}\rho_{\partial M}\|^2(\gamma_z(t)) \geq \frac{\left(\Delta\rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t))\right)^2}{n-1} = \frac{\left(h_{f,z}(t) - f_z'(t)\right)^2}{n-1}.$$

Using (3.2), we see

$$\begin{aligned}(3.3)\qquad 0 &\geq \mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t)) + \frac{f_z'(t)^2}{N-n} + \frac{\left(h_{f,z}(t) - f_z'(t)\right)^2}{n-1} - h_{f,z}'(t) \\ &= \mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t)) + \frac{(1-N)\, f_z'(t)^2}{(n-1)(n-N)} + \frac{h_{f,z}^2(t)}{n-1} \\ &\qquad - \left(\frac{2h_{f,z}(t)\, f_z'(t)}{n-1} + h_{f,z}'(t)\right).\end{aligned}$$

The last term in the right hand side of (3.3) satisfies

$$\frac{2h_{f,z}(t)f_z'(t)}{n-1}+h_{f,z}'(t)=e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\left(e^{\frac{2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\,h_{f,z}(t)\right)'.$$

We put $F_z(t):=e^{\frac{2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\,h_{f,z}(t)$. From $N\in(-\infty,1]$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}0&\geq \mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))+\frac{(1-N)\,f_z'(t)^2}{(n-1)\,(n-N)}+\frac{h_{f,z}^2(t)}{n-1}-e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\,F_z'(t)\\&\geq \mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))+\frac{h_{f,z}^2(t)}{n-1}-e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\,F_z'(t).\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}F_z'(t)&\geq e^{\frac{2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\left(\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))+\frac{h_{f,z}^2(t)}{n-1}\right)\\&=\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))\,e^{\frac{2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}+\frac{F_z^2(t)}{n-1}\,e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

We arrive at the desired inequality (3.1). □

Remark 3.1. Assume that for some $t_0\in(0,\tau(z))$ the equality in (3.1) holds. Then the equality in the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in (3.2) holds; in particular, there exists a constant c such that $\mathrm{Hess}\,\rho_{\partial M}=c\,g$ on the orthogonal complement of $\nabla\rho_{\partial M}$ at $\gamma_z(t_0)$. Moreover, the equalities in (3.4) hold; in particular, $(1-N)f_z'(t_0)^2=0$.

Recall that the functions τ_f and $s_{f,z}$ are defined as (1.5) and as (1.6), respectively. We denote by $t_{f,z}:[0,\tau_f(z)]\to[0,\tau(z)]$ the inverse function of $s_{f,z}$.

We define a function $H_{\kappa,\lambda}:[0,\bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s):=-(n-1)\frac{s_{\kappa,\lambda}'(s)}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)}.\tag{3.5}$$

For all $s\in[0,\bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})$ we see

$$H_{\kappa,\lambda}'(s)=(n-1)\kappa+\frac{H_{\kappa,\lambda}^2(s)}{n-1}.\tag{3.6}$$

We prove the following pointwise Laplacian comparison inequality:

Lemma 3.2. *Take $z\in\partial M$. For $N\in(-\infty,1]$, suppose that for all $t\in(0,\tau(z))$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))\geq(n-1)\kappa\,e^{\frac{-4f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}$, and suppose $H_{f,z}\geq(n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. Then for all $s\in(0,\min\{\tau_f(z),\bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}\})$ we have*

$$\Delta_f\rho_{\partial M}\left(\gamma_z\left(t_{f,z}(s)\right)\right)\geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)\,e^{\frac{-2f\left(\gamma_z\left(t_{f,z}(s)\right)\right)}{n-1}}.\tag{3.7}$$

In particular, for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ *with* $s_{f,z}(t) \in (0, \min\{\tau_f(z), \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}\})$

$$\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_{f,z}(t))\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. We define a function $F_z : (0, \tau(z)) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_z := \left(e^{\frac{2f}{n-1}}\, \Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}\right) \circ \gamma_z,$$

and a function $\hat{F}_z : (0, \tau_f(z)) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\hat{F}_z := F_z \circ t_{f,z}$. By Lemma 3.1 and the curvature assumption, for all $s \in (0, \tau_f(z))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_z'(s) &= F_z'(t_{f,z}(s))\, e^{\frac{2f\left(\gamma_z\left(t_{f,z}(s)\right)\right)}{n-1}} \\ &\geq \mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t_{f,z}(s)))\, e^{\frac{4f\left(\gamma_z\left(t_{f,z}(s)\right)\right)}{n-1}} + \frac{F_z^2(t_{f,z}(s))}{n-1} \\ &\geq (n-1)\kappa + \frac{\hat{F}_z^2(s)}{n-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

The identity (3.6) implies that for all $s \in (0, \min\{\tau_f(z), \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}\})$

$$\hat{F}_z'(s) - H_{\kappa,\lambda}'(s) \geq \frac{\hat{F}_z^2(s) - H_{\kappa,\lambda}^2(s)}{n-1}. \tag{3.10}$$

Now, we define a function $G_{\kappa,\lambda,z} : (0, \min\{\tau_f(z), \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}\}) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$G_{\kappa,\lambda,z} := s_{\kappa,\lambda}^2 \left(\hat{F}_z - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\right). \tag{3.11}$$

From (3.10) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\kappa,\lambda,z}' &= 2 s_{\kappa,\lambda} s_{\kappa,\lambda}' \left(\hat{F}_z - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\right) + s_{\kappa,\lambda}^2 \left(\hat{F}_z' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}'\right) \\ &\geq 2 s_{\kappa,\lambda} s_{\kappa,\lambda}' \left(\hat{F}_z - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\right) + s_{\kappa,\lambda}^2 \frac{\hat{F}_z^2 - H_{\kappa,\lambda}^2}{n-1} \\ &= \frac{s_{\kappa,\lambda}^2}{n-1} \left(\hat{F}_z - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\right)^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Since $G_{\kappa,\lambda,z}(s)$ converges to a non-negative value $e^{\frac{2f(z)}{n-1}} H_{f,z} - (n-1)\lambda$ as $s \to 0$, we see that $G_{\kappa,\lambda,z}$ is non-negative. We conclude that $\hat{F}_z \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}$ holds on $(0, \min\{\tau_f(z), \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}\})$, and hence (3.7). □

Remark 3.2. Assume that for some $s_0 \in (0, \min\{\tau_f(z), \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}\})$ the equality in (3.7) holds. Then we have $G_{\kappa,\lambda,z}(s_0) = 0$, where $G_{\kappa,\lambda,z}$ is the function defined as (3.11). From $G_{\kappa,\lambda,z}' \geq 0$ it follows that $G_{\kappa,\lambda,z} = 0$ on $[0, s_0]$; in particular, the equality in (3.7) holds on $[0, s_0]$. Since the equalities in (3.9), (3.10) and (3.12) hold, the equality in (3.1) holds on $[0, t_{f,z}(s_0)]$ (see Remark 3.1).

Remark 3.3. Perales [16] has shown a Laplacian comparison inequality for the distance function from the boundary in a barrier sense for manifolds with boundary of non-negative Ricci curvature. We can prove that the Laplacian comparison inequality (3.8) in Lemma 3.2 globally holds in a barrier sense.

For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, define a function $\tau_\delta : \partial M \to (0, \infty]$ by $\tau_\delta := e^{-2\delta}\,\tau$. Notice that if $f \circ \gamma_z \leq (n-1)\delta$ on $(0, \tau(z))$, then $\tau_\delta(z) \leq \tau_f(z)$.

From Lemma 3.2 we deduce the following estimate for τ_f:

Lemma 3.3. *Take $z \in \partial M$. Let κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose that for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t)) \geq (n-1)\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}$, and suppose $H_{f,z} \geq (n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. Then we have $\tau_f(z) \leq C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. In particular, if we suppose further that for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $f \circ \gamma_z \leq (n-1)\delta$ on $(0, \tau(z))$, then $\tau_\delta(z) \leq C_{\kappa,\lambda}$.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose $\tau_f(z) > C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. We see $\tau(z) > t_{f,z}(C_{\kappa,\lambda})$. By Lemma 3.2, for every $t \in (0, t_{f,z}(C_{\kappa,\lambda}))$

$$\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_{f,z}(t))\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}};$$

in particular, $\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) \to \infty$ as $t \to t_{f,z}(C_{\kappa,\lambda})$. This contradicts the smoothness of $\rho_{\partial M} \circ \gamma_z$ on $(0, \tau(z))$. □

Remark 3.4. Lemma 3.3 enables us to restate the conclusion of Lemma 3.2 as follows: For all $s \in (0, \tau_f(z))$ we have (3.7). In particular, for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have (3.8).

3.2. **Equality cases.** Recall the following radial curvature equation (see e.g., Theorem 2 in [17]):

Lemma 3.4. *Let ρ be a smooth function defined on a domain in M such that $\|\nabla\rho\| = 1$. Let X be a parallel vector field along an integral curve of $\nabla\rho$ that is orthogonal to $\nabla\rho$. Then we have*

$$g(R(X, \nabla\rho)\nabla\rho, X) = g(\nabla_{\nabla\rho} A_{\nabla\rho} X, X) - g(A_{\nabla\rho} A_{\nabla\rho} X, X),$$

where R is the curvature tensor induced from g, and $A_{\nabla\rho}$ is the shape operator of the level set of ρ toward $\nabla\rho$. In particular, if there exists a function φ defined on the domain of the integral curve such that $A_{\nabla\rho} X = -\varphi\, X$, then we have

$$g(R(X, \nabla\rho)\nabla\rho, X) = -(\varphi' + \varphi^2)\|X\|^2.$$

For the equality case of (3.7) in Lemma 3.2, we have:

Lemma 3.5. *Under the same setting as in Lemma 3.2, assume that for some $s_0 \in (0, \tau_f(z))$ the equality in* (3.7) *holds. Choose an orthonormal*

basis $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ *of* $T_z\partial M$*, and let* $\{Y_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ *be the* ∂M*-Jacobi fields along* γ_z *with initial conditions* $Y_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$ *and* $Y'_{z,i}(0) = -A_{u_z}e_{z,i}$*. Then for all* i *we have* $Y_{z,i} = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}\, E_{z,i}$ *on* $[0, t_{f,z}(s_0)]$*, where* $F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}$ *is the function defined as* (1.7)*, and* $\{E_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ *are the parallel vector fields along* γ_z *with initial condition* $E_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$*; moreover, if* $N \in (-\infty, 1)$*, then* $f \circ \gamma_z$ *is constant on* $[0, t_{f,z}(s_0)]$*.*

Proof. Put $t_0 := t_{f,z}(s_0)$. Since the equality in (3.7) holds at s_0, the equality in (3.1) also holds on $[0, t_0]$ (see Remark 3.1). In this case, there exists a function φ on the set $\gamma_z((0, t_0))$ such that at each point on $\gamma_z((0, t_0))$ we have $\operatorname{Hess}\rho_{\partial M} = \varphi\, g$ on the orthogonal complement of $\nabla\rho_{\partial M}$ (see Remark 3.2). Put $\varphi_z := \varphi \circ \gamma_z$. For each i, it holds that

$$g(A_{\nabla\rho_{\partial M}}E_{z,i}, E_{z,i}) = -\operatorname{Hess}\rho_{\partial M}(E_{z,i}, E_{z,i}) = -\varphi_z;$$

in particular, $A_{\nabla\rho_{\partial M}}E_{z,i} = -\varphi_z\, E_{z,i}$. From Lemma 3.4 we deduce

$$R(E_{z,i}, \nabla\rho_{\partial M})\nabla\rho_{\partial M} = -(\varphi'_z + \varphi_z^2)E_{z,i}. \tag{3.13}$$

We define a function $\mathcal{F}_z : [0, t_0] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_z(t) := \exp\left(\int_0^t \varphi_z(a)\, da\right).$$

By (3.13), a vector field $\tilde{Y}_{z,i}$ along $\gamma_z|_{[0,t_0]}$ defined by $\tilde{Y}_{z,i} := \mathcal{F}_z\, E_{z,i}$ is a ∂M-Jacobi field along $\gamma_z|_{[0,t_0]}$ with initial conditions $Y_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$ and $Y'_{z,i}(0) = -A_{u_z}e_{z,i}$. Therefore, $Y_{z,i}$ coincides with $\tilde{Y}_{z,i}$ on $[0, t_0]$.

Put $f_z := f\circ\gamma_z$ and $h_{f,z} := (\Delta_f\rho_{\partial M})\circ\gamma_z$. By the equality assumption, we have $e^{\frac{2f_z}{n-1}}\, h_{f,z} = H_{\kappa,\lambda} \circ s_{f,z}$ on $[0, t_0]$ (see Remarks 3.1 and 3.2). Furthermore, $\operatorname{Hess}\rho_{\partial M} = \varphi\, g$ implies that for each $t \in [0, t_0]$ we have $\Delta\rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) = -(n-1)\varphi_z(t)$. Hence we see

$$\varphi_z(t) = \frac{1}{n-1}\left(f_z(t) - \int_0^t e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(a))}{n-1}}\, (H_{\kappa,\lambda} \circ s_{f,z})\,(a)\, da\right)'.$$

It follows that $\mathcal{F}_z(t)$ is equal to

$$\exp\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\left(f_z(t) - f(z) - \int_0^t e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(a))}{n-1}}\, (H_{\kappa,\lambda} \circ s_{f,z})(a)\, da\right)\right),$$

and hence $\mathcal{F}_z(t) = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}(t)$. We conclude $Y_{z,i} = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}\, E_{z,i}$ on $[0, t_0]$.

We have $(1 - N)(f'_z)^2 = 0$ on $[0, t_0]$ (see Remarks 3.1 and 3.2). If $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then $f'_z = 0$ on $[0, t_0]$; in particular, f_z is constant. □

For the equality case of (3.8), Lemma 3.5 implies:

Lemma 3.6. *Under the same setting as in Lemma 3.2, assume that for some* $t_0 \in (0, \tau(z))$ *the equality in* (3.8) *holds. Choose an orthonormal basis* $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ *of* $T_z\partial M$*, and let* $\{Y_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ *be the* ∂M*-Jacobi fields along*

γ_x with initial conditions $Y_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$ and $Y'_{z,i}(0) = -A_{u_z} e_{z,i}$. Then for all i we have $Y_{z,i} = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}\, E_{z,i}$ on $[0, t_0]$, where $F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}$ is the function defined as (1.7), and $\{E_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_z with initial condition $E_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then $f \circ \gamma_z$ is constant on $[0, t_0]$.

4. Global Laplacian comparisons

In this section, we develop the pointwise Laplacian comparison result (Lemma 3.2) obtained in Section 3. We study global Laplacian comparisons in a distribution sense in the case where f is bounded from above, and in the case where f is ∂M-radial.

4.1. **Bounded cases.** For $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we say that κ and λ satisfy the *monotone-condition* if $H_{\kappa,\lambda} \geq 0$ and $H'_{\kappa,\lambda} \geq 0$ on $[0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})$, where $H_{\kappa,\lambda}$ is the function defined as (3.5). We see that κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition if and only if either (1) κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition; or (2) $\kappa \leq 0$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$. For κ and λ satisfying the monotone-condition, if $\kappa = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$, then $H_{\kappa,\lambda} = 0$ on $[0, \infty)$; otherwise, we have $H_{\kappa,\lambda} > 0$ on $(0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})$.

We say that κ and λ satisfy the *weakly-monotone-condition* if $H'_{\kappa,\lambda} \geq 0$ on $[0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})$. Notice that κ and λ satisfy the weakly-monotone-condition if and only if either (1) $\kappa \geq 0$; or (2) $\kappa < 0$ and $|\lambda| \geq \sqrt{|\kappa|}$. In particular, if κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition, then they satisfy the weakly-monotone-condition. For κ and λ satisfying the weakly-monotone-condition, if $\kappa \leq 0$ and $|\lambda| = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$, then $H_{\kappa,\lambda} = (n-1)\lambda$ on $[0, \infty)$; otherwise, we have $H'_{\kappa,\lambda} > 0$ on $[0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})$.

If f is bounded from above, then we have the following:

Lemma 4.1. *Take $z \in \partial M$. Let κ and λ satisfy the weakly-monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose that for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t)) \geq (n-1)\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}$, and suppose $H_{f,z} \geq (n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \circ \gamma_z \leq (n-1)\delta$ on $(0, \tau(z))$. Then for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have*

$$\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(e^{-2\delta} t)\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, if κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition, then

$$\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(e^{-2\delta} t)\, e^{-2\delta}. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. From the boundedness of f, for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$, we deduce

$$s_{f,z}(t) \geq e^{-2\delta} t, \quad e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}} \geq e^{-2\delta}.$$

By Lemma 3.2 and the monotonicity of $H_{\kappa,\lambda}$, for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$,

$$\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_{f,z}(t))\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}} \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(e^{-2\delta}t)\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}, \tag{4.3}$$

and hence (4.1). Moreover, if κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition, then (4.1) and the positivity of $H_{\kappa,\lambda}$ imply

$$\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(e^{-2\delta}t)\, e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}} \geq H_{\kappa,\lambda}(e^{-2\delta}t)\, e^{-2\delta}, \tag{4.4}$$

and hence (4.2). □

Remark 4.1. Assume that for some $t_0 \in (0, \tau(z))$ the equality in (4.1) holds. Then the equalities in (4.3) hold. It follows that the equality in (3.8) holds (see Lemma 3.6). Moreover, if either (1) $\kappa > 0$; or (2) $\kappa \leq 0$ and $|\lambda| > \sqrt{|\kappa|}$, then we have $H'_{\kappa,\lambda} > 0$ on $[0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})$, and hence $s_{f,z}(t_0) = e^{-2\delta}t_0$; in particular, $f \circ \gamma_z = (n-1)\delta$ on $[0, t_0]$.

Remark 4.2. Assume that for some $t_0 \in (0, \tau(z))$ the equality in (4.2) holds. Then the equalities in (4.4) hold. It follows that the equality in (4.1) holds (see Remark 4.1). Moreover, if either (1) κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition; or (2) $\kappa < 0$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$, then $H_{\kappa,\lambda} > 0$ on $(0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda})$, and hence $e^{-2}_{f,z}(t_0) = e^{-2\delta}$; in particular, $(f \circ \gamma_z)(t_0) = (n-1)\delta$.

From Lemma 4.1 we deduce:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. Take $z \in \partial M$. Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose that for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}^N_f(\gamma'_z(t)) \geq (n-1)\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}$, and suppose $H_{f,z} \geq (n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \circ \gamma_z \leq (n-1)\delta$ on $(0, \tau(z))$. Then for every monotone increasing smooth function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, and for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_{f,p}\, (\varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta})\, (\gamma_z(t)) \\ &\geq -e^{-2p\delta} \left\{ \left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1} \right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\, (\varphi')^{p-1} \right) \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta} \right\} (\gamma_z(t)), \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where the function $\rho_{\partial M,\delta} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $\rho_{\partial M,\delta} := e^{-2\delta}\rho_{\partial M}$.

Proof. We put $\Phi := \varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}$. Define a function $\varphi_\delta : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi_\delta(t) := \varphi(e^{-2\delta}t)$. We see $\Phi = \varphi_\delta \circ \rho_{\partial M}$. By straightforward computations, for each $t \in (0, \tau(z))$

$$\Delta_{f,p}\, \Phi(\gamma_z(t)) = -\left((\varphi'_\delta)^{p-1} \right)' (t) + \Delta_{f,2}\rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t))\ (\varphi'_\delta)^{p-1}\, (t).$$

From Lemma 4.1 we deduce

$$\Delta_{f,p}\, \Phi(\gamma_z(t)) \geq -\left((\varphi'_\delta)^{p-1} \right)' (t) + H_{\kappa,\lambda}(e^{-2\delta}t)\, e^{-2\delta}\ (\varphi'_\delta)^{p-1}\, (t). \tag{4.6}$$

Notice that

$$(\varphi'_\delta)^{p-1}(t) = e^{-2(p-1)\delta}\,(\varphi')^{p-1}(e^{-2\delta}t),$$
$$\left((\varphi'_\delta)^{p-1}\right)'(t) = e^{-2p\delta}\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)'(e^{-2\delta}t).$$

Hence the right hand side of (4.6) is equal to that of (4.5). □

Remark 4.3. The equality case of Lemma 4.2 results in that of Lemma 4.1 (see Remark 4.2).

We prove the following global Laplacian comparison inequality:

Proposition 4.3. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that the triple $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. Then for every monotone increasing smooth function $\varphi : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\Delta_{f,p}\,(\varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}) \ge -e^{-2p\delta}\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\,(\varphi')^{p-1}\right) \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}$$

in a distribution sense on M. More precisely, for every non-negative smooth function $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$*, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}(4.7)\qquad &\int_M \|\nabla(\varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta})\|^{p-2}\, g(\nabla\psi, \nabla(\varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}))\, d\,m_f \\ &\ge -e^{-2p\delta}\int_M \psi\left\{\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\,(\varphi')^{p-1}\right) \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}\right\} d\,m_f.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a sequence $\{\Omega_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of closed subsets of M such that for every k, the set $\partial\Omega_k$ is a smooth hypersurface in M, and satisfying the following: (1) for all k_1, k_2 with $k_1 < k_2$, we have $\Omega_{k_1} \subset \Omega_{k_2}$; (2) $M \setminus \operatorname{Cut}\partial M = \bigcup_k \Omega_k$; (3) $\partial\Omega_k \cap \partial M = \partial M$ for all k; (4) for each k, on $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial M$, there exists a unique unit outer normal vector field ν_k for Ω_k with $g(\nu_k, \nabla\rho_{\partial M}) \ge 0$.

Put $\Phi := \varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}$. Let $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative smooth function whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$. For the canonical Riemannian volume measure vol_k on $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial M$, put $m_{f,k} :=$

$e^{-f|_{\partial\Omega_k\setminus\partial M}}\,\mathrm{vol}_k$. By the Green formula and $\partial\Omega_k\cap\partial M=\partial M$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega_k}\|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,g\left(\nabla\psi,\nabla\Phi\right)\,d\,m_f\\&=\int_{\Omega_k}\left(-\psi\,g\left(\nabla\left(\|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\right),\nabla\Phi\right)+\|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,\psi\,\Delta_{f,2}\Phi\right)\,d\,m_f\\&\qquad\qquad+\int_{\partial\Omega_k\setminus\partial M}\|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,\psi\,g\left(\nu_k,\nabla\Phi\right)\,d\,m_{f,k}.\end{aligned}$$

This is equal to

$$\int_{\Omega_k}\psi\,\Delta_{f,p}\Phi\,d\,m_f+\int_{\partial\Omega_k\setminus\partial M}\|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,\psi\,g\left(\nu_k,\nabla\Phi\right)\,d\,m_{f,k}.$$

From Lemma 4.2 and $g(\nu_k,\nabla\rho_{\partial M,\delta})\geq 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega_k}\|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,g\left(\nabla\psi,\nabla\Phi\right)\,d\,m_f\\&\geq-e^{-2p\delta}\int_{\Omega_k}\psi\,\left\{\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)'-H_{\kappa,\lambda}\,(\varphi')^{p-1}\right)\circ\rho_{\partial M,\delta}\right\}\,d\,m_f.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $k\to\infty$, we obtain (4.7). □

Remark 4.4. In Proposition 4.3, assume that the equality in (4.7) holds. In this case, for a fixed $z\in\partial M$ we see that for every $t\in(0,\tau(z))$ the equality in (4.5) also holds. The equality case of Proposition 4.3 results in that of Lemma 4.2 (see Remark 4.3).

4.2. **Radial cases.** Suppose that f is ∂M-radial. In this case, there exists a smooth function $\phi_f:[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $f=\phi_f\circ\rho_{\partial M}$ on M. Define a function $s_f:[0,\infty]\to[0,\infty]$ by

$$s_f(t):=\int_0^t e^{\frac{-2\phi_f(a)}{n-1}}\,da. \tag{4.8}$$

For the image I_f of s_f, let $t_f:I_f\to[0,\infty]$ be the inverse function of s_f. Notice that the function $\rho_{\partial M,f}:M\to\mathbb{R}$ defined as (1.16) satisfies $\rho_{\partial M,f}=s_f\circ\rho_{\partial M}$ on M. For every $z\in\partial M$, we see $s_{f,z}=s_f$ and $t_{f,z}=t_f$ on $[0,\tau(z)]$ and on $[0,\tau_f(z)]$, respectively.

If f is ∂M-radial, then we have the following comparison inequality:

Lemma 4.4. *Let $p\in(1,\infty)$. Take $z\in\partial M$. For $N\in(-\infty,1]$, suppose that for all $t\in(0,\tau(z))$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))\geq(n-1)\kappa\,e^{\frac{-4f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}$, and suppose $H_{f,z}\geq(n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. Suppose that f is ∂M-radial. Then for*

every monotone increasing smooth function $\varphi : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$*, and for all* $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}(4.9)\qquad &\Delta_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f,p}\left(\varphi\circ\rho_{\partial M,f}\right)(\gamma_z(t))\\ &\geq -e^{\frac{-2pf}{n-1}}\left\{\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\,(\varphi')^{p-1}\right)\circ\rho_{\partial M,f}\right\}(\gamma_z(t)).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Put $\Phi := \varphi\circ\rho_{\partial M,f}$. If we put $\varphi_f := \varphi\circ s_f$, then $\Phi = \varphi_f\circ\rho_{\partial M}$. For each $t \in (0,\tau(z))$, the left hand side of (4.9) is equal to

$$-\left(\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}\right)'(t) + \Delta_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f,2}\,\rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t))\,\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}(t).$$

We see

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f,2}\,\rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) &= \left(\Delta_f\,\rho_{\partial M} - \frac{2(p-1)}{n-1}\,g\left(\nabla f, \nabla\rho_{\partial M}\right)\right)(\gamma_z(t))\\ &= \Delta_f\,\rho_{\partial M}(\gamma_z(t)) - \frac{2(p-1)}{n-1}\,\phi_f'(t).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2, and by $s_{f,z}(t) = s_f(t)$ and $e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}} = s_f'(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f,p}\,\Phi(\gamma_z(t)) \geq &-\left(\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}\right)'(t) + H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_f(t))\,s_f'(t)\,\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}(t)\\ &- \frac{2(p-1)}{n-1}\,\phi_f'(t)\,\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}(t),\end{aligned}$$

where the function s_f is defined as (4.8). Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}(t) &= (\varphi')^{p-1}(s_f(t))\,(s_f')^{p-1}(t),\\ \left(\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}\right)'(t) &= \left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)'(s_f(t))\,(s_f')^p(t) + (\varphi')^{p-1}(s_f(t))\,((s_f')^{p-1})'(t)\\ &= \left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)'(s_f(t))\,(s_f')^p(t) - \frac{2(p-1)}{n-1}\phi_f'(t)\,\left(\varphi_f'\right)^{p-1}(t).\end{aligned}$$

We also note that $\rho_{\partial M,f} = s_f\circ\rho_{\partial M}$ on M. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f,p}\,\Phi(\gamma_z(t))\\ &\geq -(s_f')^p(t)\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)'(s_f(t)) - H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_f(t))\,(\varphi')^{p-1}(s_f(t))\right)\\ &= -e^{\frac{-2pf}{n-1}}\left\{\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\,(\varphi')^{p-1}\right)\circ\rho_{\partial M,f}\right\}(\gamma_z(t)).\end{aligned}$$

We obtain (4.9). □

From Lemma 4.4 we derive the following global comparison result:

Proposition 4.5. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that f is ∂M-radial. Then for every monotone increasing smooth function $\varphi : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\Delta_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f,p}\left(\varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,f}\right) \geq -e^{\frac{-2pf}{n-1}}\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\left(\varphi'\right)^{p-1}\right) \circ \rho_{\partial M,f}$$

in a distribution sense on M. More precisely, for every non-negative smooth function $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$*, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_M \|\nabla\left(\varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,f}\right)\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\psi, \nabla\left(\varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,f}\right)\right)\, d\, m_{\frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f}\\ \geq &-\int_M \psi\left\{\left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\left(\varphi'\right)^{p-1}\right) \circ \rho_{\partial M,f}\right\} d\, m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a sequence $\{\Omega_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of closed subsets of M such that for every k, the set $\partial\Omega_k$ is a smooth hypersurface in M, and satisfying the following: (1) for all k_1, k_2 with $k_1 < k_2$, we have $\Omega_{k_1} \subset \Omega_{k_2}$; (2) $M \setminus \operatorname{Cut}\partial M = \bigcup_k \Omega_k$; (3) $\partial\Omega_k \cap \partial M = \partial M$ for all k; (4) for each k, on $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial M$, there exists a unique unit outer normal vector field ν_k for Ω_k with $g(\nu_k, \nabla\rho_{\partial M}) \geq 0$.

Put $\Phi := \varphi \circ \rho_{\partial M,f}$. Let $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative smooth function whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$. For $\hat{f} := (n+1-2p)(n-1)^{-1}f$, and for the canonical Riemannian volume measure vol_k on $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial M$, put $m_{\hat{f},k} := e^{-\hat{f}|_{\partial\Omega_k\setminus\partial M}}\,\mathrm{vol}_k$. By the Green formula, and by $\partial\Omega_k \cap \partial M = \partial M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega_k} \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\psi, \nabla\Phi\right)\, d\, m_{\hat{f}}\\ =&\int_{\Omega_k}\left(-\psi\, g\left(\nabla\left(\|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\right), \nabla\Phi\right) + \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,\psi\,\Delta_{\hat{f},2}\Phi\right) d\, m_{\hat{f}}\\ &\qquad + \int_{\partial\Omega_k\setminus\partial M} \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,\psi\, g\left(\nu_k, \nabla\Phi\right)\, d\, m_{\hat{f},k}.\end{aligned}$$

This is equal to

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \psi\,\Delta_{\hat{f},p}\Phi\, d\, m_{\hat{f}} + \int_{\partial\Omega_k\setminus\partial M} \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2}\,\psi\, g\left(\nu_k, \nabla\Phi\right)\, d\, m_{\hat{f},k}.$$

Lemma 4.4 and $g(\nu_k, \nabla\rho_{\partial M,f}) \geq 0$ imply

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_k} \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\psi, \nabla\Phi\right)\, d\, m_{\hat{f}} \\
&\geq -\int_{\Omega_k} \psi\, e^{\frac{-2pf}{n-1}} \left\{ \left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1} \right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\, (\varphi')^{p-1} \right) \circ \rho_{\partial M,f} \right\} d\, m_{\hat{f}} \\
&= -\int_{\Omega_k} \psi \left\{ \left(\left((\varphi')^{p-1} \right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\, (\varphi')^{p-1} \right) \circ \rho_{\partial M,f} \right\} d\, m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}.
\end{aligned}$$

By letting $k \to \infty$, we have the desired inequality. □

5. Splitting theorems

We are now going to prove our main theorems.

5.1. **Main splitting theorems.** We prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\kappa \leq 0$ and $\lambda := \sqrt{|\kappa|}$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that f is bounded from above.

Let $z_0 \in \partial M$ satisfy $\tau(z_0) = \infty$. For the connected component ∂M_0 of ∂M containing z_0, we put

$$\Omega := \{z \in \partial M_0 \mid \tau(z) = \infty\}.$$

By the continuity of τ, the set Ω is closed in ∂M_0.

We show that Ω is open in ∂M_0. Fix $z_1 \in \Omega$. Take $l > 0$, and put $x_0 := \gamma_{z_1}(l)$. There exists an open neighborhood U of x_0 contained in $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$. Taking U smaller, we may assume that for each $x \in U$ the unique foot point on ∂M of x belongs to ∂M_0. By Lemma 2.4, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $x \in B_\epsilon(x_0)$, all asymptotes for γ_{z_1} from x lie in $\operatorname{Int} M$. We may assume $U \subset B_\epsilon(x_0)$. Fix $x_1 \in U$, and take an asymptote $\gamma_{x_1} : [0, \infty) \to M$ for γ_{z_1} from x_1. For $t > 0$, define a function $b_{\gamma_{z_1},t} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$b_{\gamma_{z_1},t}(x) := b_{\gamma_{z_1}}(x_1) + t - d_M(x, \gamma_{x_1}(t)).$$

We see that $b_{\gamma_{z_1},t} - \rho_{\partial M}$ is a support function of $b_{\gamma_{z_1}} - \rho_{\partial M}$ at x_1. Since γ_{x_1} lie in $\operatorname{Int} M$, for every $t > 0$ the function $b_{\gamma_{z_1},t}$ is smooth on a neighborhood of x_1. From Lemma 2.9 we deduce

$$\Delta_f b_{\gamma_{z_1},t}(x_1) \leq -H_\kappa\left(e^{\frac{-2\sup f}{n-1}} t\right) e^{\frac{-2f(x_1)}{n-1}},$$

where H_κ is the function defined as (2.3). Note that $H_\kappa(s)$ tends to $(n-1)\sqrt{|\kappa|}$ as $s \to \infty$. Furthermore, $\rho_{\partial M}$ is smooth on U, and by (3.8) we have $\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M} \geq (n-1)\sqrt{|\kappa|} e^{\frac{-2f}{n-1}}$ on U. Hence $b_{\gamma_{z_1}} - \rho_{\partial M}$ is f-subharmonic on U. Since $b_{\gamma_{z_1}} - \rho_{\partial M}$ takes the maximal value 0 at

x_1, Lemma 2.7 implies $b_{\gamma_{z_1}} = \rho_{\partial M}$ on U. By Lemma 2.3, the set Ω is open in ∂M_0.

Since ∂M_0 is connected, we have $\Omega = \partial M_0$. By Lemma 2.1, ∂M is connected and $\operatorname{Cut}\partial M$ is empty. The equality in (3.8) holds on $\operatorname{Int} M$. For each $z \in \partial M$, choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ of $T_z\partial M$. Let $\{Y_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the ∂M-Jacobi fields along γ_z with initial conditions $Y_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$ and $Y'_{z,i}(0) = -A_{u_z} e_{z,i}$. By Lemma 3.6, for all i we see $Y_{z,i} = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}\, E_{z,i}$ on $[0,\infty)$, where $\{E_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_z with initial condition $E_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$. Moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then $f\circ\gamma_z$ is constant on $[0,\infty)$. Define a diffeomorphism $\Phi : [0,\infty) \times \partial M \to M$ by $\Phi(t,z) := \gamma_z(t)$. The rigidity of Jacobi fields implies that Φ is a Riemannian isometry with boundary from $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$ to M. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

5.2. **Weighted Ricci curvature on the boundary.** The author [22] has shown the following (see Lemma 5.5 in [22]):

Lemma 5.1 ([22])**.** *Take $z \in \partial M$, and take a unit vector u in $T_z\partial M$. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ of $T_z\partial M$ with $e_{z,1} = u$. Then for all $N \in (-\infty,\infty)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Ric}^{N-1}_{f|_{\partial M}}(u) = {} & \operatorname{Ric}^N_f(u) + g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)\, g(S(u,u), u_z) \\ & - K_g(u_z, u) + \operatorname{trace} A_{S(u,u)} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \|S(u, e_{z,i})\|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where $K_g(u_z, u)$ is the sectional curvature at z determined by u_z and u.

Using Lemma 5.1, we show:

Lemma 5.2. *Take $z \in \partial M$, and take a unit vector u in $T_z\partial M$. If M is isometric to $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$, then for all $N \in (-\infty,\infty)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Ric}^{N-1}_{f|_{\partial M}}(u) = {} & \operatorname{Ric}^N_f(u) + (n-1)\lambda^2 e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} - \kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} \\ & - \lambda\, g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)\, e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}} + \frac{\operatorname{Hess} f(u_z, u_z)}{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ of $T_z\partial M$ with $e_{z,1} = u$. Let $\{Y_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the ∂M-Jacobi fields along γ_z with initial conditions $Y_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$ and $Y'_{z,i}(0) = -A_{u_z} e_{z,i}$. Since there exists a Riemannian isometry with boundary from M to $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$, for all i we see $Y_{z,i} = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}\, E_{z,i}$, where $\{E_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_z with initial condition $E_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$. For all i we have

$$A_{u_z} e_{z,i} = -Y'_{z,i}(0) = -\left(\frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)}{n-1} - \lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}\right) e_{z,i}. \tag{5.2}$$

From (5.2) we deduce $S(u, e_{z,i}) = 0_z$ for all $i \neq 1$, and we also deduce

$$S(u,u) = -\left(\frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)}{n-1} - \lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}\right) u_z, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\operatorname{trace} A_{S(u,u)} = (n-1)\left(\frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)}{n-1} - \lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}\right)^2. \tag{5.4}$$

The sectional curvature $K_g(u_z, u)$ at z determined by u_z and u satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} K_g(u_z, u) &= -g(Y''_{z,1}(0), u) \\ &= -\left(\frac{\operatorname{Hess} f(u_z, u_z)}{n-1} + \left(\frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)}{n-1}\right)^2 - \kappa e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Combining Lemma 5.1, (5.3), (5.4) and (5.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Ric}^{N-1}_{f|_{\partial M}}(u) = \operatorname{Ric}^N_f(u) &- \frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)^2}{n-1} + \lambda\, g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)\, e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}} \\ &+ \frac{\operatorname{Hess} f(u_z, u_z)}{n-1} + \left(\frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)}{n-1}\right)^2 - \kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} \\ &+ (n-1)\left(\frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)}{n-1} - \lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)}{n-1}\right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Ric}^{N-1}_{f|_{\partial M}}(u) = \operatorname{Ric}^N_f(u) &+ (n-1)\lambda^2 e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} - \kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} \\ &- \lambda\, g((\nabla f)_z, u_z)\, e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}} + \frac{\operatorname{Hess} f(u_z, u_z)}{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see the lemma. □

5.3. **Multi-splitting.** Let M_0 be a connected complete Riemannian manifold (without boundary). A minimal geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M_0$ is said to be a *line*.

Wylie [26] has proved the following splitting theorem of Cheeger-Gromoll type (see Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3 in [26]):

Theorem 5.3 ([26])**.** *Let M_0 be a connected complete Riemannian manifold, and let $f_0 : M_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function bounded from above. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose $\operatorname{Ric}^N_{f_0, M_0} \geq 0$. If M_0 contains a line, then there exists a Riemannian manifold $\widetilde{M_0}$ such that M_0 is isometric to a warped product space over $\mathbb{R} \times \widetilde{M_0}$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then M_0 is isometric to the standard product $\mathbb{R} \times \widetilde{M_0}$.*

From Theorem 5.3 we derive the following corollary of Theorem 1.1:

Corollary 5.4. *Let $\kappa \le 0$ and $\lambda := \sqrt{|\kappa|}$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that f is bounded from above. If for some $z_0 \in \partial M$ we have $\tau(z_0) = \infty$, then there exist an integer $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and an $(n-1-k)$-dimensional Riemannian manifold $\widetilde{\partial M}$ containing no line such that ∂M is isometric to $\mathbb{R}^k \times \widetilde{\partial M}$; in particular, M is isometric to $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \left(\mathbb{R}^k \times \widetilde{\partial M}\right)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.1, M is isometric to $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$, and for each $z \in \partial M$ the function $f \circ \gamma_z$ is constant on $[0,\infty)$. In particular, $g((\nabla f)_z, u_z) = 0$ and $\operatorname{Hess} f(u_z, u_z) = 0$. By Lemma 5.2, and by $\kappa \le 0$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$, for every unit vector u in $T_z\partial M$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Ric}^{N-1}_{f|_{\partial M}}(u) &= \operatorname{Ric}^N_f(u) + (n-1)\lambda^2 e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} - \kappa e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} \\ &\ge \operatorname{Ric}^N_f(u) + (n-1)\lambda^2 e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} \\ &\ge (n-1)\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} + (n-1)\lambda^2 e^{\frac{-4f(z)}{n-1}} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\operatorname{Ric}^{N-1}_{f|_{\partial M}, \partial M} \ge 0$. Now, $N-1$ is smaller than 1, and $f|_{\partial M}$ is bounded from above. Therefore, by applying Theorem 5.3 to ∂M inductively, we complete the proof. □

5.4. **Variants of splitting theorems.** We have already known several rigidity results studied by Kasue [10] (and Croke and Kleiner [6], Ichida [9]) for manifolds with boundary whose boundaries are disconnected. We study generalizations of the results in [10] (and [6], [9]).

For $A_1, A_2 \subset M$, we put $d_M(A_1, A_2) := \inf_{x_1 \in A_1, x_2 \in A_2} d_M(x_1, x_2)$.

The following has been proved in [10] (see Lemma 1.6 in [10]):

Lemma 5.5 ([10])**.** *Suppose that ∂M is disconnected. Let $\{\partial M_i\}_{i=1,2,\dots}$ be the connected components of ∂M. Assume that ∂M_1 is compact. Put $D := \inf_{i=2,3,\dots} d_M(\partial M_1, \partial M_i)$. Then there exists a connected component ∂M_2 of ∂M such that $d_M(\partial M_1, \partial M_2) = D$. Furthermore, for every $i = 1, 2$ there exists $z_i \in \partial M_i$ such that $d_M(z_1, z_2) = D$. The minimal geodesic $\gamma : [0, D] \to M$ from z_1 to z_2 is orthogonal to ∂M both at z_1 and at z_2, and the restriction $\gamma|_{(0,D)}$ lies in* $\operatorname{Int} M$.

Wylie [26] has proved the following (see Theorem 5.1 in [26]):

Theorem 5.6 ([26])**.** *For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower $(0, 0, N)$-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is disconnected. Let $\{\partial M_i\}_{i=1,2,\dots}$ be the connected components of ∂M. Assume that ∂M_1 is compact. Put $D := \inf_{i=2,3,\dots} d_M(\partial M_1, \partial M_i)$. Then M is*

isometric to $[0,D]\times_{F_{0,0}}\partial M_1$*, and for all* $z\in\partial M_1$ *and* $t\in[0,D]$ *we have* $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))=0$.

For $\kappa>0$ and $\lambda<0$, put $D_{\kappa,\lambda}:=\inf\{\,t>0\,|\,s'_{\kappa,\lambda}(t)=0\,\}$.

By using Theorem 5.6, we obtain the following splitting:

Theorem 5.7. *Let* $\kappa>0$*. For* $N\in(-\infty,1]$*, assume that* $(M,\partial M,f)$ *has lower* (κ,λ,N)*-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that* ∂M *is disconnected. Let* $\{\partial M_i\}_{i=1,2,\dots}$ *be the connected components of* ∂M*. Assume that* ∂M_1 *is compact. Put* $D:=\inf_{i=2,3,\dots}d_M(\partial M_1,\partial M_i)$*. For* $\delta\in\mathbb{R}$*, suppose* $f\le(n-1)\delta$ *on* M*. Then* $\lambda<0$ *and* $D\le 2e^{2\delta}D_{\kappa,\lambda}$*; moreover, if* $D=2e^{2\delta}D_{\kappa,\lambda}$*, then* M *is isometric to* $[0,D]\times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}}\partial M_1$*, and* $f=(n-1)\delta$ *on* M*.*

Proof. If we have $\lambda\ge 0$, then Theorem 5.6 implies that M is isometric to $[0,D]\times_{F_{0,0}}\partial M_1$, and for all $z\in\partial M_1$ and $t\in[0,D]$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t))=0$. This contradicts $\kappa>0$, and hence $\lambda<0$.

We prove that if we have $D\ge 2e^{2\delta}D_{\kappa,\lambda}$, then M is isometric to $[0,2e^{2\delta}D_{\kappa,\lambda}]\times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}}\partial M_1$, and $f=(n-1)\delta$ on M. Suppose $D\ge 2e^{2\delta}D_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Lemma 5.5 implies that there exists a connected component ∂M_2 of ∂M such that $d_M(\partial M_1,\partial M_2)=D$. For each $i=1,2$, let $\rho_{\partial M_i}:M\to\mathbb{R}$ be a function defined by $\rho_{\partial M_i}(x):=d_M(x,\partial M_i)$. We put

$$\Omega:=\{x\in\operatorname{Int}M\mid\rho_{\partial M_1}(x)+\rho_{\partial M_2}(x)=D\}.$$

The set Ω is a non-empty closed subset of $\operatorname{Int}M$.

We show that Ω is open in $\operatorname{Int}M$. Fix $x\in\Omega$. For each $i=1,2$, we take a foot point $z_{x,i}\in\partial M_i$ on ∂M_i of x such that $d_M(x,z_{x,i})=\rho_{\partial M_i}(x)$. From the triangle inequality we derive $d_M(z_{x,1},z_{x,2})=D$. The minimal geodesic $\gamma:[0,D]\to M$ from $z_{x,1}$ to $z_{x,2}$ is orthogonal to ∂M at $z_{x,1}$ and at $z_{x,2}$. Furthermore, $\gamma|_{(0,D)}$ lies in $\operatorname{Int}M$ and passes through x. There exists an open neighborhood U of x such that $\rho_{\partial M_i}$ is smooth on U. By using (4.1), for all $y\in U$, we see

$$\begin{aligned}(5.6)\qquad -\frac{\Delta_f\,(\rho_{\partial M_1}+\rho_{\partial M_2})(y)}{(n-1)e^{\frac{-2f(y)}{n-1}}}&\le\frac{s'_{\kappa,\lambda}}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}}(\rho_{\partial M_1,\delta}(y))+\frac{s'_{\kappa,\lambda}}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}}(\rho_{\partial M_2,\delta}(y))\\&=\frac{s'_{\kappa,\lambda}(\rho_{\partial M_1,\delta}(y)+\rho_{\partial M_2,\delta}(y))-\lambda s_{\kappa,\lambda}(\rho_{\partial M_1,\delta}(y)+\rho_{\partial M_2,\delta}(y))}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}(\rho_{\partial M_1,\delta}(y))s_{\kappa,\lambda}(\rho_{\partial M_2,\delta}(y))},\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_{\partial M_i,\delta}:M\to\mathbb{R}$ is a function defined by $\rho_{\partial M_i,\delta}:=e^{-2\delta}\rho_{\partial M_i}$. Since $\kappa>0$, the function $s'_{\kappa,\lambda}/s_{\kappa,\lambda}$ is monotone decreasing on $(0,C_{\kappa,\lambda})$, and satisfies $s'_{\kappa,\lambda}(2D_{\kappa,\lambda})/s_{\kappa,\lambda}(2D_{\kappa,\lambda})=\lambda$. By the triangle inequality and the assumption $D\ge 2e^{2\delta}D_{\kappa,\lambda}$, we have $\rho_{\partial M_1,\delta}+\rho_{\partial M_2,\delta}\ge 2D_{\kappa,\lambda}$ on U. The inequality (5.6) tells us that $-(\rho_{\partial M_1}+\rho_{\partial M_2})$ is f-subharmonic on U. By Lemma 2.7, the set Ω is open in $\operatorname{Int}M$.

The connectedness of $\operatorname{Int} M$ implies $\operatorname{Int} M = \Omega$. The equality in (4.1) holds. For each $z \in \partial M_1$, choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ of $T_z\partial M$. Let $\{Y_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the ∂M-Jacobi fields along γ_z with initial conditions $Y_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$ and $Y'_{z,i}(0) = -A_{u_z}e_{z,i}$. For all i we see $Y_{z,i} = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}E_{z,i}$ on $[0, D]$, where $\{E_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_z with initial condition $E_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$. Moreover, $f \circ \gamma_z = (n-1)\delta$ on $[0, D]$ (see Remark 4.1). We see $D = 2e^{2\delta}D_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Define a diffeomorphism $\Phi : [0, D] \times \partial M_1 \to M$ by $\Phi(t, z) := \gamma_z(t)$. By the rigidity of Jacobi fields, we see that Φ is a Riemannian isometry with boundary from $[0, D] \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M_1$ to M. This completes the proof. □

6. Inscribed radii

6.1. **Inscribed radius comparisons.** We first show the following:

Proposition 6.1. *Let κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Then we have $D^{g_f}(M, \partial M) \le C_{\kappa,\lambda}$, where $D^{g_f}(M, \partial M)$ is defined as* (1.8).

Proof. Take $x \in M$, and a foot point z_x on ∂M of x. For $l := \rho_{\partial M}(x)$,

$$\rho^{g_f}_{\partial M}(x) \le L_{g_f}(\gamma_{z_x}|_{[0,l]}) = \int_0^l e^{\frac{-2f(\gamma_{z_x}(a))}{n-1}}\, da \le \tau_f(z_x) \le \sup_{z\in\partial M} \tau_f(z),$$

where $L_{g_f}(\gamma_{z_x}|_{[0,l]})$ is the length of $\gamma_{z_x}|_{[0,l]}$ determined by g_f. It follows that $D^{g_f}(M, \partial M) \le \sup_{z\in\partial M} \tau_f(z)$. From Lemma 3.3 we derive the desired inequality. □

If f is bounded from above, then we have:

Proposition 6.2. *Let κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. Then we have $D_\delta(M, \partial M) \le C_{\kappa,\lambda}$, where $D_\delta(M, \partial M)$ is defined as* (1.13).

Proof. We see $D_\delta(M, \partial M) = e^{-2\delta}D(M, \partial M)$. Let $\tau_\delta : \partial M \to (0, \infty]$ be the function defined as $\tau_\delta := e^{-2\delta}\tau$. Since $D(M, \partial M) = \sup_{z\in\partial M} \tau(z)$, we have $D_\delta(M, \partial M) = \sup_{z\in\partial M} \tau_\delta(z)$. Hence Lemma 3.3 implies the desired inequality. □

6.2. **Inscribed radius rigidity.** We prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. By Proposition 6.1, we have (1.12).

Let $x_0 \in M$ satisfy $\rho^{g_f}_{\partial M}(x_0) = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Put $l := \rho_{\partial M}(x_0)$ and

$$\Omega := \{x \in \operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\} \mid \rho_{\partial M}(x) + \rho_{x_0}(x) = l\}.$$

Take a foot point z_{x_0} on ∂M of x_0, and a minimal geodesic $\gamma_0 : [0, l] \to M$ from z_{x_0} to x_0. For all $t \in (0, l)$, we have $\gamma_0(t) \in \Omega$. Hence Ω is a non-empty closed subset of $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$.

We show that Ω is open in $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$. Fix $x \in \Omega$, and take a foot point z_x on ∂M of x. Note that z_x is also a foot point on ∂M of x_0. Let $\gamma : [0, l] \to M$ be the minimal geodesic from z_x to x_0. Then $\gamma|_{(0,l)}$ passes through x. There exists an open neighborhood U of x such that ρ_{x_0} and $\rho_{\partial M}$ are smooth on U, and for every $y \in U$ there exists a unique minimal geodesic in M from x_0 to y that lies in $\operatorname{Int} M$. By Lemma 2.8 and (3.8), for each $y \in U$

$$\begin{aligned}(6.1)\quad -\frac{\Delta_f(\rho_{\partial M} + \rho_{x_0})(y)}{(n-1)\, e^{\frac{-2f(y)}{n-1}}} &\le \frac{s'_{\kappa,\lambda}}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}}(s_{f,z_y}(\rho_{\partial M}(y))) + \frac{s'_{\kappa}}{s_{\kappa}}(s_{f,u_y}(\rho_{x_0}(y))) \\ &= \frac{s_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_{f,z_y}(\rho_{\partial M}(y)) + s_{f,u_y}(\rho_{x_0}(y)))}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_{f,z_u}(\rho_{\partial M}(y)))\, s_{\kappa}(s_{f,u_y}(\rho_{x_0}(y)))},\end{aligned}$$

where z_y is a unique foot point on ∂M of y, and u_y is the initial velocity vector at x_0 of the minimal geodesic from x_0 to y. Let $\rho^{g_f}_{x_0} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be the distance function from x_0 induced from g_f defined as $\rho^{g_f}_{x_0}(\hat{y}) := d^{g_f}_M(\hat{y}, x_0)$. By the triangle inequality for the distance function $d^{g_f}_M$,

$$\begin{aligned}(6.2)\quad s_{f,z_y}(\rho_{\partial M}(y)) + s_{f,u_y}(\rho_{x_0}(y)) &= L_{g_f}(\gamma_{z_y}|_{[0,\rho_{\partial M}(y)]}) + L_{g_f}(\gamma_{u_y}|_{[0,\rho_{x_0}(y)]}) \\ &\ge \rho^{g_f}_{\partial M}(y) + \rho^{g_f}_{x_0}(y) \ge \rho^{g_f}_{\partial M}(x_0) = C_{\kappa,\lambda},\end{aligned}$$

where $L_{g_f}(\gamma_{z_y}|_{[0,\rho_{\partial M}(y)]})$ and $L_{g_f}(\gamma_{u_y}|_{[0,\rho_{x_0}(y)]})$ are the lengths of the curve $\gamma_{z_y}|_{[0,\rho_{\partial M}(y)]}$ and of the curve $\gamma_{u_y}|_{[0,\rho_{x_0}(y)]}$ determined by g_f, respectively. Combining (6.1) and (6.2), we have $\Delta_f(\rho_{\partial M} + \rho_{x_0})(y) \ge 0$. From Lemma 2.7 we deduce $U \subset \Omega$. Hence the set Ω is open.

Since $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$ is connected, we have $\Omega = \operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$, and hence $\rho_{\partial M} + \rho_{x_0} = l$ on M. This implies $M = B_l(x_0)$. For each $u \in U_{x_0}M$, we have $\tau_{x_0}(u) = l$, and γ_u is orthogonal to ∂M at l. The equality in (2.4) holds on $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ of $T_{x_0}M$ with $e_{u,n} = u$. Let $\{Y_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the Jacobi fields along γ_u with initial conditions $Y_{u,i}(0) = 0_{x_0}$ and $Y'_{u,i}(0) = e_{u,i}$. By Lemma 2.10, for all i we have $Y_{u,i} = F_{\kappa,u}\, E_{u,i}$ on $[0, l]$, where $\{E_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_u with initial condition $E_{u,i}(0) = e_{u,i}$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then $f \circ \gamma_u$ is constant on $[0, l]$. Since the equalities in (6.2) hold, we have $s_{f,u}(l) = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$ and $F_{\kappa,u}(l) > 0$; in particular, we have no conjugate point of x_0 along γ_u. Define a diffeomorphism

$\Phi : [0,l] \times U_{x_0}M \to M$ by $\Phi(t,u) := \gamma_u(t)$. By the rigidity of Jacobi fields, Φ is a Riemannian isometry with boundary from $[0,l] \times_{F_\kappa} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ to M. Therefore, M is isometric to $[0,l] \times_{F_\kappa} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

Assume $N \in (-\infty, 1)$. Then there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f = (n-1)\delta$ on M. In this case, for all $t \in [0,l]$ we see

$$F_{\kappa,u}(t) = e^{2\delta}\, s_\kappa\left(e^{-2\delta}t\right) = s_{\kappa e^{-4\delta}}(t), \quad l = e^{2\delta}C_{\kappa,\lambda} = C_{\kappa e^{-4\delta},\lambda e^{-2\delta}}.$$

Hence $[0,l] \times_{F_\kappa} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ can be written as $B^n_{\kappa e^{-4\delta},\lambda e^{-2\delta}}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

We next prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. Proposition 6.2 implies (1.14).

Let $x_0 \in M$ satisfy $\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x_0) = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Put $l := \rho_{\partial M}(x_0)$ and

$$\Omega := \{x \in \operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\} \mid \rho_{\partial M}(x) + \rho_{x_0}(x) = l\}.$$

The set Ω is a non-empty closed subset of $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$.

We prove that Ω is open in $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$. For a fixed $x \in \Omega$, there exists an open neighborhood U of x such that ρ_{x_0} and $\rho_{\partial M}$ are smooth on U, and for every $y \in U$ there exists a unique minimal geodesic in M from x_0 to y that lies in $\operatorname{Int} M$. Define a function $\rho_{x_0,\delta} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\rho_{x_0,\delta} := e^{-2\delta}\rho_{x_0}$. By Lemma 2.9 and (4.1), for each $y \in U$

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\Delta_f(\rho_{\partial M} + \rho_{x_0})(y)}{(n-1)\, e^{\frac{-2f(y)}{n-1}}} &\le \frac{s'_{\kappa,\lambda}}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}}(\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(y)) + \frac{s'_\kappa}{s_\kappa}(\rho_{x_0,\delta}(y)) \\ &= \frac{s_{\kappa,\lambda}(\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(y) + \rho_{x_0,\delta}(y))}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}(\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(y))\, s_\kappa(\rho_{x_0,\delta}(y))} \le 0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.7 implies $U \subset \Omega$. Hence Ω is open.

From the connectedness of $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$ we deduce $\Omega = \operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$, and hence $\rho_{\partial M} + \rho_{x_0} = l$ on M. This implies $M = B_l(x_0)$. For each $u \in U_{x_0}M$, we have $\tau_{x_0}(u) = l$, and γ_u is orthogonal to ∂M at l. The equality in (2.4) holds on $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \{x_0\}$. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ of $T_{x_0}M$ with $e_{u,n} = u$. Let $\{Y_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the Jacobi fields along γ_u with initial conditions $Y_{u,i}(0) = 0_{x_0}$ and $Y'_{v,i}(0) = e_{u,i}$. For all i we have $Y_{u,i} = F_{\kappa,u}\, E_{u,i}$ on $[0,l]$, where $F_{\kappa,u}$ is the function defined as (1.11), and $\{E_{u,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_u with initial condition $E_{u,i}(0) = e_{u,i}$; moreover, $f \circ \gamma_u = (n-1)\delta$ on $[0,l]$ (see Remark 2.1 and Lemma 2.10). We see that $F_{\kappa,u} = s_{\kappa e^{-4\delta}}$ on $[0,l]$, and that $l = C_{\kappa e^{-4\delta},\lambda e^{-2\delta}}$; in particular, we have no conjugate point of x_0 along γ_u. Define a diffeomorphism $\Phi : [0,l] \times U_{x_0}M \to M$ by $\Phi(t,u) := \gamma_u(t)$. By

the rigidity of Jacobi fields, Φ is a Riemannian isometry with boundary from $B^n_{\kappa e^{-4\delta},\lambda e^{-2\delta}}$ to M. Therefore, M is isometric to $B^n_{\kappa e^{-4\delta},\lambda e^{-2\delta}}$. We complete the proof. □

7. Volume growths

In what follows, let $m_{f,\partial M} := e^{-f|_{\partial M}} \mathrm{vol}_h$. In this section, we study volume growths of neighborhoods of the boundaries. We first discuss absolute volume comparisons. One of the absolute comparison results is the following: For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, if $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds, and if ∂M is compact, then for all $r > 0$ we have

$$m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(B_{r,f}(\partial M)\right) \le s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)\, m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M) \tag{7.1}$$

for the function $s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}$ defined as (1.15) (see Lemma 7.5). We next prove Theorem 1.4, and another relative volume comparison theorem (see Theorem 7.8). Furthermore, we conclude rigidity theorems for the equality cases of the volume comparisons (see Theorems 7.10 and 7.12).

7.1. Volume elements.

For $z \in \partial M$ and $s \in (0, \tau_f(z))$, we put

$$\hat{\theta}_f(s, z) := \theta_f(t_{f,z}(s), z), \tag{7.2}$$

where $t_{f,z}$ is the inverse function of $s_{f,z}$.

We show the following volume element comparison inequality:

Lemma 7.1. *Take $z \in \partial M$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose that for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}^N_f(\gamma_z'(t)) \ge (n-1)\kappa e^{\frac{-4f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}$, and suppose $H_{f,z} \ge (n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. Then for all $s_1, s_2 \in [0, \tau_f(z))$ with $s_1 \le s_2$*

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}_f(s_2, z)}{\hat{\theta}_f(s_1, z)} \le \frac{s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_2)}{s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_1)},$$

where $\hat{\theta}_f(s, z)$ is defined as (7.2). In particular, for all $s \in [0, \tau_f(z))$

$$\hat{\theta}_f(s, z) \le e^{-f(z)}\, s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s). \tag{7.3}$$

Proof. By (2.1) and (3.7), for all $s \in (0, \tau_f(z))$ we see

$$\frac{d}{ds} \log \frac{\hat{\theta}_f(s, z)}{s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)} = -\left(e^{\frac{2f}{n-1}}\, \Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}\right)(\gamma_z(t_{f,z}(s))) + H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s) \le 0,$$

where $H_{\kappa,\lambda}$ is the function defined as (3.5). This implies the lemma. □

Remark 7.1. Assume that for some $s_0 \in (0, \tau_f(z))$ the equality in (7.3) holds. Then the equality in (7.3) holds on $[0, s_0]$; in particular, the equality in (3.7) holds on $[0, s_0]$ (see Lemma 3.5).

For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $\tau_\delta : \partial M \to (0, \infty]$ is defined as $\tau_\delta := e^{-2\delta}\tau$. For $z \in \partial M$ and $s \in (0, \tau_\delta(z))$, we put

$$\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s, z) := \theta_f(e^{2\delta}s, z). \tag{7.4}$$

If f is bounded from above, then we have the following:

Lemma 7.2. *Take $z \in \partial M$. Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, suppose that for all $t \in (0, \tau(z))$ we have $\mathrm{Ric}_f^N(\gamma_z'(t)) \geq (n-1)\kappa\, e^{\frac{-4f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}$, and suppose $H_{f,z} \geq (n-1)\lambda e^{\frac{-2f(z)}{n-1}}$. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \circ \gamma_z \leq (n-1)\delta$ on $(0, \tau(z))$. Then for all $s_1, s_2 \in [0, \tau_\delta(z))$ with $s_1 \leq s_2$ we have*

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_2, z)}{\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_1, z)} \leq \frac{s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(s_2)}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(s_1)},$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s, z)$ is defined as (7.4). In particular, for all $s \in [0, \tau_\delta(z))$

$$\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s, z) \leq e^{-f(z)}\, s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(s). \tag{7.5}$$

Proof. By (2.1) and (4.2), for all $s \in (0, \tau_\delta(z))$ we see

$$\frac{d}{ds} \log \frac{\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s, z)}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(s)} = -\Delta_f \rho_{\partial M}\left(\gamma_z\left(e^{2\delta}s\right)\right) e^{2\delta} + H_{\kappa,\lambda}(s) \leq 0.$$

This implies the desired inequality. □

Remark 7.2. Assume that for some $s_0 \in (0, \tau_\delta(z))$ the equality in (7.5) holds. Then the equality in (7.5) holds on $[0, s_0]$; in particular, the equality in (4.2) holds on $[0, e^{2\delta}s_0]$ (see Remark 4.2).

7.2. **Absolute volume comparisons.** For $r > 0$, we put

$$U_{r,f} := \{z \in \partial M \mid \tau_f(z) \leq r\}, \quad \widehat{U}_{r,f} := \bigcup_{z \in U_{r,f}} \{\gamma_z(t) \mid t \in [0, \tau(z))\}$$

$$V_{r,f} := \{z \in \partial M \mid \tau_f(z) > r\}, \quad \widehat{V}_{r,f} := \bigcup_{z \in V_{r,f}} \{\gamma_z(t) \mid t \in [0, t_{f,z}(r)]\}.$$

We begin with the following:

Lemma 7.3. *For all $r > 0$ we have*

$$B_{r,f}(\partial M) \setminus \mathrm{Cut}\, \partial M = \widehat{U}_{r,f} \sqcup \widehat{V}_{r,f}.$$

Proof. First, we show

$$B_{r,f}(\partial M) \setminus \mathrm{Cut}\, \partial M \subset \widehat{U}_{r,f} \sqcup \widehat{V}_{r,f}. \tag{7.6}$$

Take $x \in B_{r,f}(\partial M) \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$, and a unique foot point z on ∂M of x. Put $l := \rho_{\partial M}(x)$. If $z \in U_{r,f}$, then $x \in \widehat{U}_{r,f}$. If $z \in V_{r,f}$, then we see

$$s_{f,z}(l) = \rho_{\partial M,f}(x) \le r < \tau_f(z);$$

in particular, $l \le t_{f,z}(r)$. We conclude (7.6).

We show the opposite of (7.6). For all $z \in U_{r,f}$ and $t \in [0, \tau(z))$,

$$\rho_{\partial M,f}(\gamma_z(t)) = s_{f,z}(t) < \tau_f(z) \le r.$$

This implies $\widehat{U}_{r,f} \subset B_{r,f}(\partial M) \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$. Furthermore, for all $z \in V_{r,f}$ and $t \in [0, t_{f,z}(r)]$, we have $t_{f,z}(r) < \tau(z)$ and $s_{f,z}(t) \le r$, and hence

$$\rho_{\partial M,f}(\gamma_z(t)) = s_{f,z}(t) \le r.$$

It follows that $\widehat{V}_{r,f} \subset B_{r,f}(\partial M) \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$. We show the opposite of (7.6), and complete the proof. □

We define a function $\check{\theta}_f : [0, \infty) \times \partial M \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\check{\theta}_f(s,z) := \begin{cases} \hat{\theta}_f(s,z) & \text{if } s < \tau_f(z), \\ 0 & \text{if } s \ge \tau_f(z), \end{cases} \tag{7.7}$$

where $\hat{\theta}_f(s,z)$ is defined as (7.2).

To prove our volume comparison theorems, we show:

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose that ∂M is compact. Then for all $r > 0$*

$$m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(B_{r,f}(\partial M)\right) = \int_{\partial M} \int_0^r \check{\theta}_f(s,z)\, ds\, d\operatorname{vol}_h,$$

where $\check{\theta}_f$ is the function defined as (7.7).

Proof. By Lemma 7.3, we have

$$m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(B_{r,f}(\partial M)\right) = m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(\widehat{U}_{r,f}\right) + m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(\widehat{V}_{r,f}\right).$$

We put

$$C_U := \int_{U_{r,f}} \int_0^{\tau(z)} e^{\frac{-(n+1)f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\, \theta(t,z)\, dt\, d\operatorname{vol}_h,$$

$$C_V := \int_{V_{r,f}} \int_0^{t_{f,z}(r)} e^{\frac{-(n+1)f(\gamma_z(t))}{n-1}}\, \theta(t,z)\, dt\, d\operatorname{vol}_h.$$

By the coarea formula and the Fubini theorem,

$$m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(\widehat{U}_{r,f}\right) = C_U, \quad m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(\widehat{V}_{r,f}\right) = C_V.$$

Furthermore, we see

$$\begin{aligned} C_U &= \int_{U_{r,f}} \int_0^{\tau(z)} \theta_f(t,z)\, s'_{f,z}(t)\, dt\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h \\ &= \int_{U_{r,f}} \int_0^{\tau_f(z)} \hat{\theta}_f(s,z)\, ds\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h = \int_{U_{r,f}} \int_0^{r} \check{\theta}_f(s,z)\, ds\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} C_V &= \int_{V_{r,f}} \int_0^{t_{f,z}(r)} \theta_f(t,z)\, s'_{f,z}(t)\, dt\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h \\ &= \int_{V_{r,f}} \int_0^{r} \hat{\theta}_f(s,z)\, ds\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h = \int_{V_{r,f}} \int_0^{r} \check{\theta}_f(s,z)\, ds\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h\,. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}\left(B_{r,f}(\partial M)\right) = C_U + C_V = \int_{\partial M} \int_0^{r} \check{\theta}_f(s,z)\, ds\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h\,.$$

We obtain the lemma. □

We prove the absolute volume comparison inequality (7.1):

Lemma 7.5. *For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. Then for all $r > 0$ we have* (7.1)*. In particular,*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{r,f}(\partial M))}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)} \le m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M).$$

Proof. By Lemma 7.1, for all $s \ge 0$ we see $\check{\theta}_f(s,z) \le e^{-f(z)}\, \bar{s}^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)$, where $\bar{s}_{\kappa,\lambda}$ is the function defined as (1.15). Integrate the both sides over $[0,r]$ with respect to s, and over ∂M with respect to z. Lemma 7.4 implies the desired inequality. □

For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$, we put $B_{r,\delta}(\partial M) := \{\, x \in M \mid \rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x) \le r \,\}$. We define a function $\check{\theta}_{f,\delta} : [0,\infty) \times \partial M \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s,z) := \begin{cases} \hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s,z) & \text{if } s < \tau_\delta(z), \\ 0 & \text{if } s \ge \tau_\delta(z), \end{cases} \tag{7.8}$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s,z)$ is defined as (7.4).

Lemma 7.6. *Let ∂M be compact. Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for all $r > 0$*

$$m_f\left(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M)\right) = e^{2\delta} \int_{\partial M} \int_0^{r} \check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s,z)\, ds\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h,$$

where $\check{\theta}_{f,\delta}$ is the function defined as (7.8)*.*

Proof. By $B_{r,\delta}(\partial M) = B_{e^{2\delta}r}(\partial M)$ and Lemma 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned} m_f(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M)) &= \int_{\partial M} \int_0^{e^{2\delta}r} \bar{\theta}_f(t,z)\, dt\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h \\ &= e^{2\delta} \int_{\partial M} \int_0^r \check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s,z)\, ds\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\theta}_f$ is the function defined as (7.2). This proves the lemma. □

If f is bounded from above, then we have:

Lemma 7.7. *Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. Then for all $r > 0$ we have*

$$m_f(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M)) \le e^{2\delta} s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)\, m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M).$$

In particular,

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{m_f(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M))}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)} \le e^{2\delta}\, m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M).$$

Proof. By Lemma 7.2, for all $s \ge 0$ we have $\check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s,z) \le e^{-f(z)}\, \bar{s}^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)$. We integrate the both sides over $[0,r]$ with respect to s, and over ∂M with respect to z. From Lemma 7.6 we deduce the lemma. □

7.3. **Relative volume comparisons.** We prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Let ∂M be compact.

By Lemma 7.1, for all $s_1, s_2 \ge 0$ with $s_1 \le s_2$

$$\check{\theta}_f(s_2, z)\ \bar{s}^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_1) \le \check{\theta}_f(s_1, z)\ \bar{s}^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_2).$$

Integrate the both sides over $[0,r]$ with respect to s_1, and then do that over $[r,R]$ with respect to s_2. It follows that

$$\frac{\int_r^R \check{\theta}_f(s_2,z)\, ds_2}{\int_0^r \check{\theta}_f(s_1,z)\, ds_1} \le \frac{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R) - s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}.$$

Lemma 7.4 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{R,f}(\partial M))}{m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{r,f}(\partial M))} &= 1 + \frac{\int_{\partial M}\int_r^R \check{\theta}_f(s_2,z)\, ds_2\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h}{\int_{\partial M}\int_0^r \check{\theta}_f(s_1,z)\, ds_1\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h} \\ &\le 1 + \frac{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R) - s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)} = \frac{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence (1.17). We complete the proof of Theorem 1.4. □

If f is bounded from above, then we have the following:

Theorem 7.8. *Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ on M. Then for all $r, R > 0$ with $r \leq R$ we have*

$$\frac{m_f(B_{R,\delta}(\partial M))}{m_f(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M))} \leq \frac{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}. \tag{7.9}$$

Proof. Lemma 7.2 implies that for all $s_1, s_2 \geq 0$ with $s_1 \leq s_2$,

$$\check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_2, z)\ \bar{s}^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_1) \leq \check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_1, z)\ \bar{s}^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s_2).$$

By integrating the both sides over $[0, r]$ with respect to s_1, and then doing that over $[r, R]$ with respect to s_2, we have

$$\frac{\int_r^R \check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_2, x)\, ds_2}{\int_0^r \check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_1, x)\, ds_1} \leq \frac{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R) - s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}.$$

From Lemma 7.6 we deduce

$$\frac{m_f(B_{R,\delta}(\partial M))}{m_f(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M))} = 1 + \frac{\int_{\partial M} \int_r^R \check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_2, z)\, ds_2\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h}{\int_{\partial M} \int_0^r \check{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s_1, z)\, ds_1\, d\,\mathrm{vol}_h} \leq \frac{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)}.$$

We obtain the desired inequality. □

7.4. **Volume growth rigidity.** We first show the following:

Lemma 7.9. *Under the same setting as in Theorem 1.4, suppose that there exists $R \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}] \setminus \{\infty\}$ such that for every $r \in (0, R]$ the equality in (1.17) holds. Then we have $\tau_f \geq R$ on ∂M.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that a point $z_0 \in \partial M$ satisfies $\tau_f(z_0) < R$. Put $t_0 := \tau_f(z_0)$, and take $\epsilon > 0$ satisfying $t_0 + \epsilon < R$. By the continuity of τ_f, there exists a closed geodesic ball B in ∂M centered at z_0 such that for all $z \in B$ we have $\tau_f(z) \leq t_0 + \epsilon$. Lemma 7.1 implies that $m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{R,f}(\partial M))$ is not larger than

$$\int_{\partial M \setminus B} \int_0^{\min\{R, \tau_f(z)\}} s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)\, ds\, d\, m_{f,\partial M} + \int_B \int_0^{t_0+\epsilon} s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)\, ds\, d\, m_{f,\partial M}.$$

This is smaller than $m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M)\, s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)$. On the other hand, $s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)$ is equal to $m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{R,f}(\partial M))/m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M)$. This is a contradiction. □

Now, we prove the following volume growth rigidity:

Theorem 7.10. *Suppose that κ and λ do not satisfy the ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. If we have*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f}(B_{r,f}(\partial M))}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)} \geq m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M), \tag{7.10}$$

then M is isometric to $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then for every $z \in \partial M$ the function $f \circ \gamma_z$ is constant.

Proof. Lemma 7.5 and Theorem 1.4 imply that for every $R > 0$, and for every $r \in (0, R]$ the equality in (1.17) holds. From Lemma 7.9 we deduce $\tau_f = \infty$ on ∂M. Hence we have $\tau = \infty$ on ∂M.

Fix $z \in \partial M$. For all $s \geq 0$ we see $\check{\theta}_f(s, z) = e^{-f(z)}\, s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)$. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ of $T_z\partial M$, and let $\{Y_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the ∂M-Jacobi fields along γ_z with initial conditions $Y_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$ and $Y'_{z,i}(0) = -A_{u_z} e_{z,i}$. For all i we have $Y_{z,i} = F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}\, E_{z,i}$ on $[0,\infty)$, where $\{E_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_z with initial condition $E_{z,i}(0) = e_{z,i}$. Moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then $f \circ \gamma_z$ is constant on $[0,\infty)$ (see Remark 7.1). Define a diffeomorphism $\Phi : [0,\infty) \times \partial M \to M$ by $\Phi(t, z) = \gamma_z(t)$. We see that Φ is a Riemannian isometry with boundary from $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$ to M. We complete the proof. □

Remark 7.3. If κ and λ satisfy the ball-condition, then the author does not know whether a similar result to Theorem 7.10 holds. In this case, under the same setting as in Theorem 7.10, Lemmas 3.3 and 7.9 imply $\tau_f = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$ on ∂M. Since for each $z \in \partial M$ the value $\tau(z)$ can be either finite or infinite, it seems to be difficult to conclude any rigidity results.

Similarly to Lemma 7.9, we show:

Lemma 7.11. *Under the same setting as in Theorem 7.8, suppose that there exists $R \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}] \setminus \{\infty\}$ such that for every $r \in (0, R]$ the equality in (7.9) holds. Then we have $\tau_\delta \geq R$ on ∂M.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that $z_0 \in \partial M$ satisfies $\tau_\delta(z_0) < R$. Let $t_0 := \tau_\delta(z_0)$, and take $\epsilon > 0$ with $t_0 + \epsilon < R$. The continuity of τ_δ implies that there exists a closed geodesic ball B in ∂M centered at z_0 such that $\tau_\delta \leq t_0 + \epsilon$ on B. By Lemma 7.2, $e^{-2\delta} m_f(B_{R,\delta}(\partial M))$ is not larger than

$$\int_{\partial M \setminus B} \int_0^{\min\{R, \tau_\delta(z)\}} s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)\, ds\, d\, m_{f,\partial M} + \int_B \int_0^{t_0+\epsilon} s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)\, ds\, d\, m_{f,\partial M}$$

that is smaller than $m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M)\, s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)$. Since $s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)$ is equal to $m_f(B_{R,\delta}(\partial M))/e^{2\delta} m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M)$, this is a contradiction. □

Next, we prove the following volume growth rigidity:

Theorem 7.12. *Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. Suppose*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{m_f(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M))}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)} \ge e^{2\delta}\, m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M).$$

Then the following hold:

1. *if κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition, then M is isometric to $B^n_{\kappa e^{-4\delta}, \lambda e^{-2\delta}}$, and $f = (n-1)\delta$ on M;*
2. *if $\kappa \le 0$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$, then M is isometric to $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$; moreover, the following hold:*
   (a) *if $\kappa = 0$ and $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then for every $z \in \partial M$ the function $f \circ \gamma_z$ is constant on $[0,\infty)$;*
   (b) *if $\kappa < 0$, then $f = (n-1)\delta$ on M.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.7 and Theorem 7.8, for all $r, R > 0$ with $r \le R$,

$$\frac{m_f(B_{R,\delta}(\partial M))}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(R)} = \frac{m_f(B_{r,\delta}(\partial M))}{s_{n,\kappa,\lambda}(r)} = e^{2\delta} m_{f,\partial M}(\partial M). \tag{7.11}$$

If κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition, then for $R = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$, and for every $r \in (0, R]$ the equality in (7.9) holds; in particular, by Lemma 7.11 we have $\tau_\delta = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$ on ∂M. If $\kappa \le 0$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$, then for every $R > 0$, and for every $r \in (0, R]$ the equality in (1.17) holds; in particular, Lemma 7.11 implies $\tau_\delta = \infty$. Hence, $\tau_\delta = \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}$ on ∂M.

If κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition, then $D_\delta(M, \partial M) = C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Due to Theorem 1.3, M is isometric to $B^n_{\kappa e^{-4\delta}, \lambda e^{-2\delta}}$, and $f = (n-1)\delta$.

If $\kappa \le 0$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$, then $\operatorname{Cut} \partial M = \emptyset$. Theorem 1.1 tells us that M is isometric to $[0,\infty) \times_{F_{\kappa,\lambda}} \partial M$; moreover, if $N \in (-\infty, 1)$, then for every $z \in \partial M$ the function $f \circ \gamma_z$ is constant on $[0,\infty)$. In the case of $\kappa < 0$, (7.11) implies that for all $s \ge 0$ and $z \in \partial M$ we have $\hat{\theta}_{f,\delta}(s, z) = e^{-f(z)} s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)$; in particular, $f = (n-1)\delta$ on M (see Remarks 4.2 and 7.2). This completes the proof. □

8. Eigenvalues

8.1. **Lower bounds.** We recall the following inequality of Picone type (see Theorem 1.1 in [1], and Lemma 7.1 in [21]):

Lemma 8.1 ([1], [21])**.** *Let ϕ and ψ be functions on M that are smooth on a domain U in M, and satisfy $\phi > 0$ and $\psi \ge 0$ on U. Then for all*

$p \in (1,\infty)$ we have the following inequality on U:

$$\|\nabla\psi\|^p \geq \|\nabla\phi\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\left(\psi^p\,\phi^{1-p}\right),\nabla\phi\right). \tag{8.1}$$

If the equality in (8.1) *holds on U, then for some constant $c \neq 0$ we have $\psi = c\,\phi$ on U.*

We prove the inequality (1.20) in Theorem 1.5.

Proposition 8.2. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that M is compact, and f is ∂M-radial. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ on M. For $D \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}] \setminus \{\infty\}$, suppose $D_f(M,\partial M) \leq D$, where $D_f(M,\partial M)$ is defined as* (1.19)*. Then we have* (1.20)*.*

Proof. Let $\hat{\varphi} : [0, D] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-zero function satisfying (1.18) for $\mu = \mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}$. We may assume $\hat{\varphi}|_{(0,D]} > 0$. The equation (1.18) is written in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\left(|\varphi'(s)|^{p-2}\varphi'(s)s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s)\right)' + \mu\,|\varphi(s)|^{p-2}\varphi(s)s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(s) = 0,\\ \varphi(0) = 0, \quad \varphi'(D) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we see $\hat{\varphi}'|_{[0,D)} > 0$. Put $\Phi := \hat{\varphi}\circ\rho_{\partial M,f}$. Take a non-negative, non-zero smooth function ψ on M whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$. From Lemma 8.1 we deduce

$$\|\nabla\psi\|^p \geq \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\left(\psi^p\,\Phi^{1-p}\right),\nabla\Phi\right) \tag{8.2}$$

on $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \operatorname{Cut}\partial M$. Here we put

$$\hat{f} := \frac{n+1}{n-1}f, \quad \check{f} := \frac{n+1-2p}{n-1}f.$$

By $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ and (8.2),

$$\begin{aligned}e^{2p\delta}\int_M \|\nabla\psi\|^p\,d\,m_{\hat{f}} &\geq \int_M e^{\frac{2pf}{n-1}}\,\|\nabla\psi\|^p\,d\,m_{\hat{f}} = \int_M \|\nabla\psi\|^p\,d\,m_{\check{f}}\\ &\geq \int_M \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\left(\psi^p\,\Phi^{1-p}\right),\nabla\Phi\right)\,d\,m_{\check{f}}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

Using (8.3) and Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{2p\delta}\int_M \|\nabla\psi\|^p\,d\,m_{\hat{f}}\\ &\geq -\int_M \psi^p\,\Phi^{1-p}\left\{\left(\left((\hat{\varphi}')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\,(\hat{\varphi}')^{p-1}\right)\circ\rho_{\partial M,f}\right\}dm_{\hat{f}}\\ &= \mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}\int_M \psi^p\,d\,m_{\hat{f}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $R_{\hat{f},p}(\psi) \geq e^{-2p\delta}\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}$. This implies (1.20). □

Remark 8.1. In Proposition 8.2, we assume that there exists a non-negative, non-zero smooth function $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$ such that $R_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f,p}(\psi) = e^{-2p\delta}\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}$. Then the equalities in (8.3) hold. Since the equality in (8.2) holds on $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \operatorname{Cut} \partial M$, for some constant $c \neq 0$ we have $\psi = c\,\Phi$ on M (see Lemma 8.1). Moreover, $f = (n-1)\delta$ on the set where $\nabla\psi \neq 0$.

We next prove the inequality (1.21) in Theorem 1.6.

Proposition 8.3. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. Let κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that M is compact. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ on M. Then we have* (1.21).

Proof. By a standard argument, we see $\mu_{0,p}(B^n_{\kappa,\lambda}) = \mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,C_{\kappa,\lambda}}$. Let $\hat{\varphi} : [0, C_{\kappa,\lambda}] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-zero function satisfying (1.18) for $\mu = \mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,C_{\kappa,\lambda}}$, and let $\hat{\varphi}|_{(0,C_{\kappa,\lambda}]} > 0$. It holds that $\hat{\varphi}'|_{[0,C_{\kappa,\lambda})} > 0$. By Proposition 6.2, we have $D_\delta(M,\partial M) \leq C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Put $\Phi := \hat{\varphi} \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}$. Take a non-negative, non-zero smooth function ψ on M whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$. By Lemma 8.1,

$$\|\nabla\psi\|^p \geq \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\left(\psi^p\,\Phi^{1-p}\right), \nabla\Phi\right) \tag{8.4}$$

on $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \operatorname{Cut}\partial M$. Notice that κ and λ satisfy the model-condition. From (8.4) and Proposition 4.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{2p\delta}\int_M \|\nabla\psi\|^p\, d\,m_f \geq e^{2p\delta}\int_M \|\nabla\Phi\|^{p-2} g\left(\nabla\left(\psi^p\,\Phi^{1-p}\right), \nabla\Phi\right)\, d\,m_f \\ &\geq -\int_M \psi^p\,\Phi^{1-p}\left\{\left(\left((\hat{\varphi}')^{p-1}\right)' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\,(\hat{\varphi}')^{p-1}\right)\circ\rho_{\partial M,\delta}\right\} d\,m_f \\ &= \mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,C_{\kappa,\lambda}}\int_M \psi^p\, d\,m_f. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain $R_{f,p}(\psi) \geq e^{-2p\delta}\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,C_{\kappa,\lambda}}$, and hence (1.21). □

Remark 8.2. In Proposition 8.3, we assume that there exists a non-negative, non-zero smooth function $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ whose support is compact and contained in $\operatorname{Int} M$ such that $R_{f,p}(\psi) = e^{-2p\delta}\mu_{0,p}(B^n_{\kappa,\lambda})$. Then the equality in (8.4) holds on $\operatorname{Int} M \setminus \operatorname{Cut}\partial M$. Hence for some constant $c \neq 0$ we have $\psi = c\,\Phi$ on M (see Lemma 8.1); moreover, we have the equality in Proposition 4.3 (see Remark 4.4).

8.2. **Equality cases.** We recall the following fact for eigenfunctions of the weighted p-Laplacian (see e.g., [21], [23]):

Proposition 8.4. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. Let $\phi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. Suppose that M is compact. Then there exists a non-negative,*

non-zero function ψ *in* $W_0^{1,p}(M, m_\phi)$ *such that* $R_{\phi,p}(\psi) = \mu_{\phi,p}(M)$. *Moreover, for some* $\alpha \in (0,1)$ *the function* ψ *is* $C^{1,\alpha}$*-Hölder continuous.*

Let Ric_M denote the infimum of Ric_g on the unit tangent bundle of M, and let $H_{\partial M} := \inf_{z\in\partial M} H_z$.

We have already known Theorem 1.5 in the case where $f = 0$ and $\delta = 0$. More precisely, we have:

Theorem 8.5 ([11], [21])**.** *Let* $p \in (1,\infty)$. *Suppose that* M *is compact. Assume* $\mathrm{Ric}_M \geq (n-1)\kappa$ *and* $H_{\partial M} \geq (n-1)\lambda$. *For* $D \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}]\setminus\{\infty\}$, *suppose* $D(M,\partial M) \leq D$. *Then we have*

$$\mu_{0,p}(M) \geq \mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}. \tag{8.5}$$

If the equality in (8.5) *holds, then* M *is isometric to a* (κ,λ)*-equational model space.*

Using Proposition 8.4 and Theorem 8.5, we prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that M is compact, and f is ∂M-radial. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \leq (n-1)\delta$ on M. For $D \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}] \setminus \{\infty\}$, suppose $D_f(M,\partial M) \leq D$, where $D_f(M,\partial M)$ is defined as (1.19). By Proposition 8.2, we have (1.20).

Assume that the equality in (1.20) holds. By applying Proposition 8.4 to the function $(n+1)(n-1)^{-1}f$, there exists a non-negative, non-zero function ψ in $W_0^{1,p}(M, m_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f})$ such that $R_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f,p}(\psi) = e^{-2p\delta}\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}$ and ψ is $C^{1,\alpha}$-Hölder continuous on M. Let $\hat{\varphi} : [0,D] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-zero function satisfying (1.18) for $\mu = \mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D}$, and let $\hat{\varphi}|_{(0,D]} > 0$. Put $\Phi := \hat{\varphi} \circ \rho_{\partial M,f}$. Then Φ coincides with a constant multiplication of ψ on M (see Remark 8.1). Since $\hat{\varphi}'|_{[0,D)} > 0$, we see $\nabla\Phi \neq 0$ on $\mathrm{Int}\, M \setminus \mathrm{Cut}\,\partial M$; in particular, $\nabla\psi \neq 0$ on $\mathrm{Int}\, M \setminus \mathrm{Cut}\,\partial M$. Hence $f = (n-1)\delta$ on M (see Remark 8.1). In this case, we have

$$\mathrm{Ric}_M \geq (n-1)\kappa e^{-4\delta}, \quad H_{\partial M} \geq (n-1)\lambda e^{-2\delta},$$

$D(M,\partial M) \leq De^{2\delta}$ and

$$\mu_{0,p}(M) = e^{-2p\delta}\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,D} = \mu_{p,\kappa e^{-4\delta},\lambda e^{-2\delta},De^{2\delta}}.$$

Due to Theorem 8.5, M is isometric to a $\left(\kappa e^{-4\delta}, \lambda e^{-2\delta}\right)$-equational model space. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

We next prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. Let κ and λ satisfy the convex-ball-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower

(κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that M is compact. For $\delta\in\mathbb{R}$, suppose $f\le(n-1)\delta$ on M.

By Proposition 8.3, we have (1.21). Assume that the equality in (1.21) holds. Notice that $\mu_{0,p}(B^n_{\kappa,\lambda})=\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,C_{\kappa,\lambda}}$. Applying Proposition 8.4 to the function f, we see that there exists a non-negative, non-zero function ψ in $W^{1,p}_0(M,m_f)$ such that $R_{f,p}(\psi)=e^{-2p\delta}\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,C_{\kappa,\lambda}}$, and ψ is $C^{1,\alpha}$-Hölder continuous on M. Let $\hat\varphi:[0,C_{\kappa,\lambda}]\to\mathbb{R}$ be a non-zero function satisfying (1.18) for $\mu=\mu_{p,\kappa,\lambda,C_{\kappa,\lambda}}$, and let $\hat\varphi|_{(0,C_{\kappa,\lambda}]}>0$. Proposition 6.2 implies $D_\delta(M,\partial M)\le C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Put $\Phi:=\hat\varphi\circ\rho_{\partial M,\delta}$. Then Φ coincides with a constant multiplication of ψ on M (see Remark 8.2); in particular, Φ is also $C^{1,\alpha}$-Hölder continuous.

Fix $z\in\partial M$. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ of $T_z\partial M$. Let $\{Y_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be the ∂M-Jacobi fields along γ_z with initial conditions $Y_{z,i}(0)=e_{z,i}$ and $Y'_{z,i}(0)=-A_{u_z}e_{z,i}$. For all i we see $Y_{z,i}=F_{\kappa,\lambda,z}\,E_{z,i}$ on $[0,\tau(z)]$, where $\{E_{z,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are the parallel vector fields along γ_z with initial condition $E_{z,i}(0)=e_{z,i}$. Moreover, $f\circ\gamma_z=(n-1)\delta$ on $[0,\tau(z)]$ (see Remark 8.2).

We prove $D_\delta(M,\partial M)=C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Assume $D_\delta(M,\partial M)<C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. Since M is compact, there exists $x_0\in M$ such that $\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x_0)=D_\delta(M,\partial M)$. Note that x_0 belongs to $\operatorname{Cut}\partial M$. Take a foot point z_0 on ∂M of x_0. By $\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x_0)<C_{\kappa,\lambda}$, and by the property of Jacobi fields, x_0 is not the first conjugate point of ∂M along γ_{z_0}. Hence $\rho_{\partial M,\delta}$ is not differentiable at x_0. Since Φ is $C^{1,\alpha}$-Hölder continuous on M, we have $\hat\varphi'(\rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x_0))=0$. This contradicts $\hat\varphi'|_{[0,C_{\kappa,\lambda})}>0$, and hence we obtain $D_\delta(M,\partial M)=C_{\kappa,\lambda}$. From Theorem 1.3 we conclude Theorem 1.6. □

8.3. **Explicit lower bounds.** By $\mu_{2,0,0,D}=\pi^2(2D)^{-2}$, we have the following corollary of Theorem 1.5:

Corollary 8.6. *For $N\in(-\infty,1]$, assume that $(M,\partial M,f)$ has lower $(0,0,N)$-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that M is compact, and f is ∂M-radial. For $\delta\in\mathbb{R}$, suppose $f\le(n-1)\delta$ on M. For $D>0$, suppose $D_f(M,\partial M)\le D$. Then we have*

$$\mu_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f,2}(M)\ge\frac{\pi^2}{4\,e^{4\delta}\,D^2}. \tag{8.6}$$

If the equality in (8.6) *holds, then M is isometric to a $(0,0)$-equational model space, and $f=(n-1)\delta$ on M.*

Kasue [11] has proved the following (see Lemma 1.3 in [11]):

Lemma 8.7 ([11])**.** *For all $D\in(0,\bar C_{\kappa,\lambda}]\setminus\{\infty\}$, we have*

$$\mu_{2,\kappa,\lambda,D}>\left(4\max_{a\in[0,D]}\int_a^D s^{n-1}_{\kappa,\lambda}(b)\,db\int_0^a s^{1-n}_{\kappa,\lambda}(b)\,db\right)^{-1}.$$

From Lemma 8.7 we derive the following corollary of Theorem 1.5:

Corollary 8.8. *For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that M is compact, and f is ∂M-radial. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. For $D \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}] \setminus \{\infty\}$, suppose $D_f(M, \partial M) \le D$. Then we have*

$$\mu_{\frac{n+1}{n-1}f,2}(M) > \left(4\, e^{4\delta} \max_{a\in[0,D]} \int_a^D s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(b)\, db \int_0^a s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{1-n}(b)\, db\right)^{-1}.$$

9. Spectra

Let Ω be a relatively compact domain in M such that the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω is a smooth hypersurface in M satisfying $\partial\Omega \cap \partial M = \emptyset$. For the canonical Riemannian volume measure $\mathrm{vol}_{\partial\Omega}$ on $\partial\Omega$, we put $m_{f,\partial\Omega} := e^{-f|_{\partial\Omega}}\, \mathrm{vol}_{\partial\Omega}$.

9.1. **Area estimates.**

We prove the following area estimate:

Proposition 9.1. *Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ, λ, N)-weighted curvature bounds. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. Let Ω be a relatively compact domain in M such that $\partial\Omega$ is a smooth hypersurface in M satisfying $\partial\Omega \cap \partial M = \emptyset$. We put*

$$D_{\delta,1}(\Omega) := \inf_{x\in\Omega} \rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x), \quad D_{\delta,2}(\Omega) := \sup_{x\in\Omega} \rho_{\partial M,\delta}(x).$$

Then we have

$$m_f(\Omega) \le e^{2\delta} \sup_{s\in(D_{\delta,1}(\Omega), D_{\delta,2}(\Omega))} \frac{\int_s^{D_{\delta,2}(\Omega)} s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(a)\, da}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(s)}\, m_{f,\partial\Omega}(\partial\Omega).$$

Proof. Define a function $\hat{\varphi} : [D_{\delta,1}(\Omega), D_{\delta,2}(\Omega)] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\hat{\varphi}(s) := \int_{D_{\delta,1}(\Omega)}^s \frac{\int_a^{D_{\delta,2}(\Omega)} s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(b)\, db}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(a)}\, da.$$

Put $\Phi := \hat{\varphi} \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta}$. By Lemma 4.2, on $\Omega \setminus \mathrm{Cut}\, \partial M$ we have

$$\Delta_f\, \Phi \ge -e^{-4\delta}\, (\hat{\varphi}'' - H_{\kappa,\lambda}\, \hat{\varphi}') \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta} = e^{-4\delta}. \tag{9.1}$$

By Lemma 2.2, there exists a sequence $\{\Omega_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of compact subsets of the closure $\bar{\Omega}$ of Ω such that for every k, the boundary $\partial\Omega_k$ of Ω_k is a smooth hypersurface in M except for a null set in $(\partial\Omega, m_{f,\partial\Omega})$, and satisfying the following: (1) for all $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_1 < k_2$, we have $\Omega_{k_1} \subset \Omega_{k_2}$; (2) $\bar{\Omega} \setminus \mathrm{Cut}\, \partial M = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \Omega_k$: (3) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and for almost every point $x \in \partial\Omega_k \cap \partial\Omega$ in $(\partial\Omega, m_{f,\partial\Omega})$, there exists a unique unit outer normal vector for Ω_k at x that coincides with the unit outer

normal vector on $\partial\Omega$ for Ω at x; (4) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, on $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega$, there exists a unique unit outer normal vector field ν_k for Ω_k such that $g(\nu_k, \nabla\rho_{\partial M}) \geq 0$.

For the canonical Riemannian volume measure vol_k on $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega$, put $m_{f,k} := e^{-f|_{\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega}}\, \mathrm{vol}_k$. Let $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ be the unit outer normal vector on $\partial\Omega$ for Ω. Integrate the both sides of (9.1) on Ω_k. By the Green formula,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-4\delta}\, m_f\,(\Omega_k) &\leq \int_{\Omega_k} \Delta_f\, \Phi\, d\, m_f \\ &= -\int_{\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega} g(\nu_k, \nabla\Phi)\, d\, m_{f,k} - \int_{\partial\Omega_k \cap \partial\Omega} g(\nu_{\partial\Omega}, \nabla\Phi)\, d\, m_{f,\partial\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $g(\nu_k, \nabla\Phi) \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega$, we have

$$e^{-4\delta}\, m_f\,(\Omega_k) \leq -\int_{\partial\Omega_k \cap \partial\Omega} g(\nu_{\partial\Omega}, \nabla\Phi)\, d\, m_{f,\partial\Omega}.$$

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we derive

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-4\delta}\, m_f\,(\Omega_k) &\leq \int_{\partial\Omega_k \cap \partial\Omega} (\hat{\varphi}' \circ \rho_{\partial M,\delta})\, |g(\nu_{\partial\Omega}, \nabla\rho_{\partial M,\delta})|\, d\, m_{f,\partial\Omega} \\ &\leq e^{-2\delta} \sup_{s \in (D_{\delta,1}(\Omega), D_{\delta,2}(\Omega))} \hat{\varphi}'(s)\, m_{f,\partial\Omega}\,(\partial\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

By letting $k \to \infty$, we complete the proof. □

Kasue [12] has proved Proposition 9.1 when $f = 0$ and $\delta = 0$.

9.2. **Spectrum estimates and rigidity.** For $\alpha > 0$, the *f-Dirichlet α-isoperimetric constant* $ID_\alpha(M, m_f)$ of M is defined as

$$ID_\alpha(M, m_f) := \inf_{\Omega} \frac{m_{f,\partial\Omega}(\partial\Omega)}{(m_f(\Omega))^{1/\alpha}},$$

where the infimum is taken over all relatively compact domains Ω in M such that $\partial\Omega$ are smooth hypersurfaces in M satisfying $\partial\Omega \cap \partial M = \emptyset$. The *$f$-Dirichlet α-Sobolev constant* $SD_\alpha(M, m_f)$ of M is defined as

$$SD_\alpha(M, m_f) := \inf_{\phi \in W_0^{1,1}(M, m_f) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_M \|\nabla\phi\|\, d\, m_f}{\left(\int_M |\phi|^\alpha\, d\, m_f\right)^{1/\alpha}},$$

where the infimum is taken over all non-zero functions ϕ in $W_0^{1,1}(M, m_f)$.

Recall the following relationship between the isoperimetric constant and the Sobolev constant (see [8], [13], [21]).

Proposition 9.2 ([8]). *For all $\alpha > 0$, $ID_\alpha(M, m_f) = SD_\alpha(M, m_f)$.*

For $D \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}]$, we put

$$C(\kappa,\lambda,D) := \sup_{s\in[0,D)} \frac{\int_s^D s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(a)\,da}{s_{\kappa,\lambda}^{n-1}(s)}. \tag{9.2}$$

Notice that $C(\kappa,\lambda,\infty)$ is finite if and only if $\kappa < 0$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{|\kappa|}$; in this case, we have $C(\kappa,\lambda,D) = ((n-1)\lambda)^{-1}\left(1 - e^{-(n-1)\lambda D}\right)$.

From Proposition 9.1 we derive the following:

Theorem 9.3. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. Let κ and λ satisfy the monotone-condition. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that the triple $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$ on M. For $D \in (0, \bar{C}_{\kappa,\lambda}]$, suppose $D_\delta(M,\partial M) \le D$. Then we have*

$$\mu_{f,p}(M) \ge \left(\, p\, e^{2\delta}\, C(\kappa,\lambda,D)\,\right)^{-p},$$

where $C(\kappa,\lambda,D)$ is the constant defined as (9.2).

Proof. Let Ω be a relatively compact domain in M such that $\partial\Omega$ is a smooth hypersurface in M with $\partial\Omega \cap \partial M = \emptyset$. Set $C_\delta := e^{2\delta}\, C(\kappa,\lambda,D)$. Proposition 9.1 implies $m_f(\Omega) \le C_\delta\, m_{f,\partial\Omega}(\partial\Omega)$. By Proposition 9.2, we obtain $SD_1(M, m_f) \ge C_\delta^{-1}$. For all $\phi \in W_0^{1,1}(M, m_f)$ we have

$$\int_M |\phi|\, d\, m_f \le C_\delta \int_M \|\nabla\phi\|\, d\, m_f. \tag{9.3}$$

Let ψ be a non-zero function in $W_0^{1,p}(M, m_f)$. Put $q := p\,(1-p)^{-1}$. In (9.3), by replacing ϕ with $|\psi|^p$, and by the Hölder inequality, we see

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M |\psi|^p\, d\, m_f &\le p\, C_\delta \int_M |\psi|^{p-1}\, \|\nabla\psi\|\, d\, m_f \\ &\le p\, C_\delta \left(\int_M |\psi|^p\, d\, m_f\right)^{1/q} \left(\int_M \|\nabla\psi\|^p\, d\, m_f\right)^{1/p}.\end{aligned}$$

Considering the Rayleigh quotient $R_{f,p}(\psi)$, we complete the proof. □

Using Theorem 9.3, we prove Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $p \in (1,\infty)$. Let $\kappa < 0$ and $\lambda := \sqrt{|\kappa|}$. For $N \in (-\infty, 1]$, assume that $(M, \partial M, f)$ has lower (κ,λ,N)-weighted curvature bounds. Suppose that ∂M is compact. For $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $f \le (n-1)\delta$.

For $D > 0$, we see $C(\kappa,\lambda,D) = ((n-1)\lambda)^{-1}\left(1 - e^{-(n-1)\lambda D}\right)$. Note that the right hand side is monotone increasing as $D \to \infty$. Put

$D_\delta := D_\delta(M, \partial M)$. From Theorem 9.3 we derive

$$\mu_{f,p}(M) \geq e^{-2p\delta} \left(p\, C(\kappa, \lambda, D_\delta) \right)^{-p} \geq e^{-2p\delta} \left(\frac{(n-1)\lambda}{p} \right)^p,$$

and hence (1.22).

Assume that the equality in (1.22) holds. The monotonicity of $C(\kappa, \lambda, D)$ with respect to D implies $D_\delta = \infty$. By the definition of D_δ, we see $D(M, \partial M) = \infty$. Since ∂M is compact, M is non-compact; in particular, for some $z_0 \in \partial M$ we have $\tau(z_0) = \infty$. Theorem 1.1 completes the proof of Theorem 1.7. □

References

[1] W. Allegretto and Y.X. Huang, *A Picone's identity for the p-Laplacian and applications*, Nonlinear Anal. 32 (1998), no. 7, 819–830.

[2] D. Bakry and M. Émery, *Diffusions hypercontractives*, Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84, 177–206, Lecture Notes in Math., 1123, Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[3] D. Burago, Y. Burago and S. Ivanov, *A Course in Metric Geometry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 33. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[4] E. Calabi, *An extension of E. Hopf's maximum principle with an application to Riemannian geometry*, Duke Math. J. 25 (1958), 45–56.

[5] J. Cheeger, *Degeneration of Riemannian metrics under Ricci curvature bounds*, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Scuola Normale Superiore. Lezione Fermiane, 2001.

[6] C. Croke and B. Kleiner, *A warped product splitting theorem*, Duke Math. J. 67 (1992), no. 3, 571–574.

[7] F. Fang, X. Li and Z. Zhang, *Two generalizations of Cheeger-Gromoll splitting theorem via Bakry-Emery Ricci curvature*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 59 (2009), no. 2, 563–573.

[8] H. Federer and W.H. Fleming, *Normal and integral currents*, Ann. of Math. (2) 72 (1960) 458–520.

[9] R. Ichida, *Riemannian manifolds with compact boundary*, Yokohama Math. J. 29 (1981), no. 2, 169–177.

[10] A. Kasue, *Ricci curvature, geodesics and some geometric properties of Riemannian manifolds with boundary*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 35 (1983), no. 1, 117–131.

[11] ———, *On a lower bound for the first eigenvalue of the Laplace operator on a Riemannian manifold*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 17 (1984), no. 1, 31–44.

[12] ———, *Applications of Laplacian and Hessian Comparison Theorems*, Geometry of geodesics and related topics (Tokyo, 1982), 333–386, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 3, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.

[13] P. Li, *Geometric Analysis*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 134. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.

[14] A. Lichnerowicz, *Variétés riemanniennes à tenseur C non négatif*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 271 1970 A650–A653.

[15] J. Lott, *Some geometric properties of the Bakry-Émery-Ricci tensor*, Comment. Math. Helv. 78 (2003), no. 4, 865–883.
[16] R. Perales, *Volumes and limits of manifolds with Ricci curvature and mean curvature bound*, Differential Geom. Appl. 48 (2016), 23–37.
[17] P. Petersen, *Riemannian Geometry: Second Edition*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 171. Springer, New York, 2006.
[18] Z. Qian, *Estimates for weighted volumes and applications*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) 48 (1997), no. 190, 235–242.
[19] T. Sakai, *Riemannian Geometry*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 149. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
[20] Y. Sakurai, *Rigidity of manifolds with boundary under a lower Ricci curvature bound*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.3845v5 (2016), to appear in Osaka J. Math..
[21] ———, *Rigidity of manifolds with boundary under a lower Bakry-Émery Ricci curvature bound*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.03223v4 (2016), to appear in Tohoku Math. J..
[22] ———, *Rigidity phenomena in manifolds with boundary under a lower weighted Ricci curvature bound*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.02493 (2016).
[23] P. Tolksdorf, *Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations*, J. Differential Equations 51 (1984), no. 1, 126–150.
[24] C. Villani, *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.
[25] G. Wei and W. Wylie, *Comparison geometry for the Bakry-Emery Ricci tensor*, J. Differential Geom. 83 (2009), no. 2, 337–405.
[26] W. Wylie, *A warped product version of the Cheeger-Gromoll splitting theorem*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.03800v2 (2016).
[27] W. Wylie and D. Yeroshkin, *On the geometry of Riemannian manifolds with density*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.08000 (2016).

Graduate School of Pure and Applied Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Tennodai 1-1-1, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8571, Japan
E-mail address: sakurai@math.tsukuba.ac.jp